

Taylor & Zimmerman

Economic & Social Conditions  
of North Carolina Farmers

---



Ec. H  
Z727e

# ECONOMIC *and* SOCIAL CONDITIONS *of* NORTH CAROLINA FARMERS

---

BASED ON A SURVEY OF  
1000 NORTH CAROLINA FARMERS  
IN THREE TYPICAL COUNTIES  
OF THE STATE



Carle C. Zimmerman and Carl C. Taylor

*Prepared Under the Direction of a Committee Appointed by  
the State Board of Agriculture Consisting  
of Representatives from*

THE NORTH CAROLINA COLLEGE FOR WOMEN  
THE NORTH CAROLINA COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE  
AND ENGINEERING  
THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA  
AND  
THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
IN CO-OPERATION WITH  
THE U. S. BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

193721  
23.1.25-

*Information Compiled and Collated  
by*

CARL C. TAYLOR  
C. C. ZIMMERMAN

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

	PAGE
THE AREA SURVEYED: The People.....	8
The Land Farmed.....	9
Farm Crop Practices.....	11
Livestock Practices .....	15
FAMILY FOOD SUPPLIES.....	17
Milk and Butter.....	19-20
Pork and Lard.....	20-21
Eggs and Poultry.....	22-23
Flour, Potatoes, Meal, and Molasses.....	23-25
Garden and Orchard Products.....	26
CASH INCOME .....	27
CREDIT .....	28
WEALTH AND EQUITY.....	32
TENURE HISTORY .....	35
THE HOMES: Houses.....	39
Home Conveniences .....	43
HEALTH AND SANITATION.....	50
Contacts with Doctors.....	51-52
Expenditures for Drugs and Doctor Bills.....	53-54
Attendance at Births.....	55-58
Water Supply .....	59-62
Disposal of Waste and Garbage.....	63-64
EDUCATION .....	64
PAPERS AND MAGAZINES TAKEN.....	67-71
BOOKS .....	72-73
RELIGION .....	74
RECREATION .....	76
CHANGE OF RESIDENCE.....	82
PER CENT HAVE AUTOS, BUGGIES, ETC.....	83-84
EXCHANGE OF WORK.....	84
OPINIONS ON COMMUNITY PROBLEMS.....	86-87

## PREFACE

This bulletin grew out of a resolution passed by the State Board of Agriculture at its annual meeting in December, 1921, as follows:

“WHEREAS, the alarming increase in tenancy presents one of the most serious problems now confronting the farmers of our State and other States. In 1880 only one American farmer in four was a tenant, whereas now practically two out of five are tenants, and the percentage is higher in North Carolina than in the country as a whole. Our public men as well as our agricultural leaders are now becoming aroused to the seriousness of this evil, and there is general demand for a thorough investigation of the whole problem, with a view to discovering precise facts and suggesting definite remedies: Therefore, be it

“Resolved by the North Carolina Board of Agriculture, That we hereby request four men in North Carolina who have given prolonged study to the question of tenancy and land ownership in this State and other States, and in foreign countries—namely, Mr. B. F. Brown, Director of our Division of Markets and Rural Organization; Dr. Carl C. Taylor, Head of the Division of Rural Economics, State College of Agriculture and Engineering; Professor E. C. Branson, Department of Rural Economics of our State University, and Dr. E. C. Lindeman, of a similar department of our State College for Women—together with two representatives of the Board of Agriculture, to come together and make plans for a thorough-going study and investigation of the whole subject of farm tenancy and proposed remedies, proceeding immediately with such studies and investigations as they are themselves prepared to carry out, and making plans for the coöperation of all these institutions in prosecuting such additional surveys and investigations as are deemed necessary.”

The committee thus appointed consisted at first of the above-named members, with Dr. Clarence Poe and Hon. C. C. Wright acting for the Board of Agriculture.

At a later date, the N. C. College for Women was represented by Dr. W. C. Jackson in the absence of Dr. Lindeman, and the University by Professor S. H. Hobbs, Jr., in the absence of Dr. Branson.

At the first meeting of the committee in Greensboro in March, 1922, it was agreed that the four institutions—the North Carolina College for Women, the State University, the State College of Agriculture and Engineering, and the State Division of Markets—should coöperate and secure, if possible, the coöperation of the U. S. Bureau of Agricultural Economics. These arrangements were perfected, the survey made, and the bulletin written under them.



The schedules were the joint work of Dr. Branson, Dr. Taylor, C. C. Zimmerman, and C. O. Brannen; the field work was carried on by W. R. Anderson, C. H. Warren and J. A. Dickey, under the direction of C. C. Zimmerman, in charge; the schedules were compiled by C. C. Zimmerman, A. J. Honeycutt and J. A. Dickey, under the direction of Dr. Taylor; and the bulletin has been written by Dr. Taylor and C. C. Zimmerman, under the general supervision of the whole committee.

B. F. BROWN, *Chairman,*

*The Tenancy Commission.*

## INTRODUCTION

The information gathered in this study is so detailed and is compiled in such tabular form that it demands some generalization to be usable by the average person. For that reason these few brief statements are made by way of introduction and as a suggestion of the many facts contained in the tables, if the reader cares to study them.

Since this is chiefly a study of the causes and effects of tenancy, it may seem that only the darker side of North Carolina rural life is portrayed in these statements and the following tables. This is undoubtedly the case, but tenancy in many of its aspects creates a dark side of rural life. These conclusions, we believe, are justified from the facts as we found them, and are about the same as any one will draw who is willing to study the tabulated data in detail.

Many people will be surprised to learn that the average amount of land being cultivated is less than eighteen acres per family. This is a small acreage upon which to make a living unless the most intensive methods of cultivation are used and exactly the right choice of crops is guaranteed.

That a wise choice of production is not being practiced, particularly for a long-time agricultural program, is indicated by the very great amount of exhaustive crops being planted in contrast to the very few improvement crops. Furthermore, it is clear from the data presented in the following tables that tenant farming is conducive to exhaustive crop farming more than owner-operator farming. The tenants and croppers in two of the three counties surveyed had over 99 per cent of all their land planted to crops which were strictly fertility-exhausting rather than soil-improving.

The tenants and croppers are almost wholly cotton and tobacco growers in the Piedmont and Coastal Plain counties. The landless farmers universally have fewer livestock than the landowners have. They produce less of their home food supply, and in addition to this they have a lower cash income. They thus not only are practicing a system of agriculture which is ruinous for the future but are not making even personal gain while they are doing it.

The crop lien is the curse of North Carolina agriculture. The landlords and owner-operators are by no means universally free from the crop lien and chattel mortgage, but the landless farmers are farming under this handicap in three times as great numbers as are the landed. Furthermore, the tenants and croppers use a much greater per cent of their credit for living purposes than the landlords and owners do. Their credit is not so much for the sake of an investment as it is for the sake of a stake to tide them over from season to season. This is not a business use of credit but a makeshift one year after another.

The great number of tenants and croppers whose fathers were tenants and croppers and the few owners who rose to ownership unaided make it clear that it is not easy to attain the status of a farm-owner in modern agriculture, and probably indicates that our numbers of tenants will continue to increase unless some means is discovered with which to assist them to the ownership of farms.

No matter how much disagreement there may be among persons as to the cause of tenancy, the effects are too clear to dispute. This is just as true of the social effects as it is of the economic effects. The landless families live in poorer houses, they live under worse sanitary conditions, have poorer health, lose more of their children by death than the owners do. They are more illiterate, fail to reach as high grades in school, take less papers and magazines, have fewer books in their homes, attend church and Sunday-school less, have fewer home amusements, attend community affairs less often.

Landless men may in many cases be accounted individually responsible for these differences, but the fact remains that our rural citizenship is less adequate because it is made up of people of this kind, and would be more adequate if these people could be made more prosperous and happy.

The following outstanding disparaging facts are set forth in bold relief, not because there are no bright spots in these peoples' lives, but that we may know these facts and if possible set about to remedy them.

Only .4 per cent of the crops grown by the black croppers of the Coastal Plain county are improvement crops.

There is only one cow for every 138 tilled acres among the white croppers and one cow for every 277 tilled acres among the black croppers of the Coastal Plain county.

The black croppers produce only 32.9 gallons of milk per year per family. This is but .07 of a quart per individual per day. Only 9 per cent of them produce milk at all.

The cash income of the white tenants and croppers of the Mountain county is less than 10 cents per day per individual.

Over 75 per cent of all the landless farmers surveyed used short-time credit to carry on their farming operations.

The equity holdings per family of the black croppers in the Piedmont county is \$36.

Thirteen per cent of all the farm lands included in this survey are being farmed by insolvent men.

Seventy-five per cent of the landless farmers are sons of landless fathers.

Two per cent of all families surveyed are living in one-room houses. If the territory covered by the survey is typical, this means that something over 6,000 rural families in this State are living in one-room houses. If we include two-room houses, then over 42,000 rural families



of the State are found to be living in these types of houses. Almost one-fifth of all the landless families surveyed are living in one- or two-room houses.

There is not a negro family or a white tenant or cropper family in the whole area surveyed that has an indoor toilet or bath tub.

Over 31 per cent of the fathers and mothers in the landless families can neither write nor read.

The average cropper had attained a school status of only third grade. The average negro had attained less than full first-grade education.

Over sixty-five per cent of all landless families surveyed take no papers or magazines 'whatsoever. Less than seven per cent of them take daily papers.

The average landless family for all surveyed attended less than two recreational events during the year of 1922.

# THE AREA SURVEYED

This survey included 1,014 farm families. Representative areas in three typical counties in the three major geographic sections of the State were covered. The areas were in Edgecombe County, in the Coastal Plain section; Chatham County, in the Piedmont section; and, Madison County, in the Mountain section. A fifteen-page schedule was used in the survey. Each family was interviewed personally and asked more than 700 questions about farm production, farm ownership, and farm life. The items contained in the following tables are as specific and as accurate as the persons interviewed could give. Because the volume of information is great, the tables are presented with the minimum of interpretation.

## THE PEOPLE

The number of persons and the number of families surveyed is relatively unimportant in this study. Tables I to III are presented to show the scope of the survey and as basic tables from which all other data are interpreted.

TABLE I—*Families and Persons by Tenure*  
(For surveyed area)

	Coastal Plain		Piedmont		Mountain		Total		Total
	Landed	Land-less	Landed	Land-less	Landed	Land-less	Landed	Land-less	All
Number of Families.....	78	261	181	154	231	109	490	524	1014
Per cent of Families.....	23.2	76.8	54.1	45.9	68.0	32.0	48.4	51.6	-----
Number of Persons at Home..	419	1316	856	834	1160	538	2435	2688	5123
Per cent of Persons at Home..	24.2	75.8	50.7	49.3	68.3	31.7	47.6	54.4	-----
Average Persons at Home per Family.....	5.37	5.05	4.17	5.42	5.02	4.94	4.97	5.14	5.05

TABLE II—*Families and Persons by Color*  
(For surveyed area)

	Coastal Plain		Piedmont		Mountain		Total		Total
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	All
Number of Families.....	203	136	190	145	340	-----	733	277	1014
Per cent of Families.....	59.9	40.1	56.8	43.2	-----	-----	72.3	27.1	-----
Number of Persons at Home.....	1003	732	860	830	1698	-----	3561	1562	5123
Per cent of Persons at Home.....	57.8	42.2	50.8	49.2	-----	-----	69.7	30.3	-----
Average Persons at Home per Family.....	4.95	5.02	4.53	5.72	4.99	-----	4.86	5.65	4.17

TABLE III—*Per cent of Different Tenure and Racial Classes*  
(For surveyed area)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	14.2	1.47	5.9	1.47	22.8	4.16	17.2	32.8
Piedmont.....	17.3	1.79	23.60	11.33	11.95	19.7	3.88	10.45
Mountain.....	20.3	-----	42.6	-----	20.9	-----	11.2	-----
Total.....	17.25	1.08	25.72	4.28	18.78	7.98	9.94	14.97

## THE LAND FARMED

The landless families were tilling 48.5 per cent of all cultivated land under the plow. The croppers were tilling 23.1 per cent of it and the tenants were tilling 25.4 per cent of it. Tables IV to VII give the detailed information for the three counties.

TABLE IV—*Land in Farms by Tenure and Race*  
(For territory surveyed)

	Per Tenure		Totals	Per Race	
	Landed	Landless		White	Black
Acres of all land.....	54,281	8,439	62,720	54,731	7,989
Per cent of all land.....	86.53	13.47	100	87.28	12.72
Acres tilled land.....	8,947	8,437	17,386	12,476	4,910
Per cent of tilled land.....	51.45	48.55	100	717	28.3
Average tilled acres per farm.....	18.2	16.1	17.1	17.0	17.4

TABLE V—*Land in Farms per Different Tenure Types*  
(For territory surveyed)

	Landlord Operators	Owner Operators	Tenants	Croppers	Total
Total acres .....	35,115	19,166	4,421	4,018	62,720
Total tilled acres .....	3,830	5,117	4,421	4,018	17,386

TABLE VI—*Per cent of Tilled Acres Farmed by Each Tenure and Color Class*  
(Per counties surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain .....	19.80	1.63	5.84	1.840	21.54	4.74	14.87	29.74
Piedmont .....	22.35	1.60	23.73	11.82	9.52	19.80	3.24	7.94
Mountain .....	32.22	-----	47.83	.13	12.73	.60	5.80	.69
Total .....	26.01	.89	29.00	3.58	14.62	6.65	7.92	11.33
	Landed		Landless		White		Black	
	59.6		40.4		77.5		22.5	

TABLE VII—*Per cent of Tilled Acres Farmed by Different Classes*  
(For territory surveyed)

	Per Tenure		Per Race	
	Landed	Landless	White	Black
Coastal Plain .....	27.90	72.10	60.78	39.22
Piedmont .....	61.40	38.60	59.70	40.30
Mountain .....	67.40	32.60	98.64	1.36
All sections .....	51.44	48.56	77.6	22.4

The outstanding facts apparent in Tables IV to VII are:

1. That all tenure classes are farming about the same amount of land per family—an average of just a little more than 17 acres.
2. Landless farmers have practically all the land under their direction in cultivation.
3. Landless men are farming the greatest percentage of land in the Coastal Plain and least in the Mountain section.
4. Negro farmers were farming a larger per cent of the land in the Piedmont than in either of the other counties.

## FARM CROP PRACTICES

An attempt was made to discover what differences, if any, there were between the landed and landless farmers in their farm practices. Complete records were taken on all crops, crop yield, animals, and home supplies produced on the farms. Tables VIII to X give the detailed information.

TABLE VIII—*Amount of Exhaustive and Improvement Crops*  
(Per counties surveyed)

		Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
		White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
COASTAL PLAIN	Exhaustive.....	1,194	105	345.5	113	1,366	309	931	1,932
	Improvement.....	99	-----	35.5	7	41	-----	39	8
	Total.....	1,293	105	381.0	120	1,407	309	970	1,940
	Per cent of exhaustive....	92.3	100	90.7	94.0	97.0	100	96.0	99.6
	Per cent of improvement...	7.7	-----	9.3	6.0	3.0	-----	4.0	0.4
PIEDMONT	Exhaustive.....	1,091	76	1,242	601	503	1,058	169	426
	Improvement.....	108	10	29	33	7	4	5	-----
	Total.....	1,199	86	1,271	634	510	1,062	174	426
	Per cent of exhaustive....	91.05	88.4	97.7	95.0	98.6	99.2	97.4	100
	Per cent of improvement...	8.95	11.6	2.3	5.0	1.4	0.8	2.6	-----
MOUNTAIN	Exhaustive.....	629	-----	2,007	6.5	866	46	440	59
	Improvement.....	2,456	-----	2,555	6.	353	9	114	7
	Total.....	3,085	-----	4,562	12.5	1,219	57	554	66
	Per cent of exhaustive....	20.4	-----	44.0	52	71.1	84.2	79.5	89.4
	Per cent of improvement...	79.6	-----	56.0	48	28.9	15.8	20.5	10.6

The following lists are the crops as they were classified for constructing Table VIII:

*Improvement Crops*

Alfalfa  
Soy beans  
Cow peas  
Rye  
Hay  
Cultivated Pasture

*Exhaustive Crops*

Cotton  
Tobacco  
Corn  
Wheat  
Oats  
Peanuts  
Sorghum  
Potatoes  
Truck

TABLE IX—*Amount and Per cent of Exhaustive Crops Per Tenure and Color Class*  
(By county)

	COASTAL PLAIN				PIEDMONT				MOUNTAIN			
	Landed	Landless	White	Black	Landed	Landless	White	Black	Landed	Landless	White	Black
Total acres exhaustive crops.....	1757	4538	3836	2459	3010	2156	3005	2161	2642.5	1413	3942	113.5
Total crops -A-----	1899	4626	4051	2474	3190	2172	3154	2208	7659.5	1896	9420	135.5
Per cent exhaustive....	94.0	99.4	82.4	99.5	94.4	99.1	95.5	97.7	34.5	74.5	42.7	83.8
Total exhaustive.....	6295				5166				4055.5			
Total crop acres.....	6525				5362				9555.5			
Per cent exhaustive....	96.5				94.6				42.9			

The following facts are apparent in Tables VIII and IX:

1. The practice of using exhaustive crops is greatest among the croppers and least among the landlord operators. It runs as high as 99.6 per cent for the black croppers in the Coastal Plains and as low as 20.4 per cent for the landlord operators in the mountains.

2. The farmers of the Coastal Plain county are using 96.5 per cent of exhaustive crops and those of the Piedmont county are using 94.6 per cent exhaustive crops. Those of the Mountain county are using only 42.9 per cent exhaustive crops.

3. The landless farmers are following a system of farming which exhausts the soil to considerable degree greater than are the landed farmers.

4. The negro farmers are using a more exhaustive crop system than are the white farmers.

TABLE X—*Per cent of Tilled Land Planted in Cotton, Tobacco, and Corn*  
(By counties surveyed)

	COASTAL PLAIN				PIEDMONT				MOUNTAIN			
	Landlords	Owner Operators	Tenants	Croppers	Landlords	Owner Operators	Tenants	Croppers	Landlords	Owner Operators	Tenants	Croppers
Cotton.....	7.55	2.62	10.50	20.36	4.64	6.17	6.52	2.23	-----	-----	-----	-----
Tobacco.....	3.34	1.46	4.97	8.57	1.45	1.61	1.64	1.18	.39	.67	.22	.12
Corn.....	7.24	2.75	9.60	14.64	17.75	18.56	15.05	4.59	6.93	22.50	10.68	5.74
Totals.....	18.13	6.83	25.07	43.57	23.84	26.34	23.21	8.00	7.32	23.11	10.90	5.86
Combined percentage by counties.....	93.60				81.39				47.25			



1. In considering crops which exhaust the soil it is generally assumed that such major crops as cotton, tobacco, and corn are the sole or only exhaustive crops. A comparison of Tables IX and X shows that the other minor exhaustive crops such as wheat, sorghum, and vegetables raise the per cent of all acres planted to exhaustive crops.

2. From Table X it is apparent that the use of exhaustive crops is highest in the county in which the tenancy rate is highest and lowest in the county in which the tenancy is lowest.

3. In the Coastal Plain county, where both the tenancy rate and exhaustive crops percentages are high, the landless farmers are leading in exhaustive crop farming.

A study was made of comparative crop yields. Tables XI to XIII present the comparative data for tenure classes for the three counties surveyed.

TABLE XI—Average Production Per Acre of Leading Cash Crops for Different Classes of Farms  
(Coastal Plain County)

COTTON			TOBACCO		
1	Negro Tenant.....	415 lbs. per @	1	White Tenant.....	823 lbs. per @
2	Negro Cropper.....	383 lbs. per @	2	White Cropper.....	802 lbs. per @
3	White Cropper.....	381 lbs. per @	3	Negro Tenant.....	752 lbs. per @
4	White Owner.....	380 lbs. per @	4	White Owner.....	751 lbs. per @
5	Negro Owner.....	378 lbs. per @	5	Negro Cropper.....	720 lbs. per @
6	White Tenant.....	367.5 lbs. per @	6	Negro Owner.....	535 lbs. per @

#### CORN

1	White Cropper.....	18.3 bu. per @
2	White Tenant.....	16.9 bu. per @
3	Negro Tenant.....	16.7 bu. per @
4	Negro Cropper.....	14.3 bu. per @
5	Negro Owner.....	13.3 bu. per @
6	White Owner.....	11.1 bu. per @

TABLE XII—Average Production Per Acre of Leading Cash Crops for Different Classes of Farms  
(Piedmont County)

COTTON		TOBACCO	
1	White Owner.....308.5 lbs. per @	1	White Owner.....585 lbs. per @
2	Negro Owner.....290 lbs. per @	2	White Tenant.....462 lbs. per @
3	White Cropper.....286.5 lbs. per @	3	Negro Tenant.....439 lbs. per @
4	Negro Tenant.....273.5 lbs. per @	4	Negro Owner.....411 lbs. per @
5	White Tenant.....270.5 lbs. per @	5	Negro Cropper.....409 lbs. per @
6	Negro Cropper.....265.5 lbs. per @	6	White Cropper.....250.5 lbs. per @

## CORN

1	White Owner.....16.25 bu. per @
2	White Tenant.....14.7 bu. per @
3	Negro Owner.....14.2 bu. per @
4	White Cropper.....14.1 bu. per @
5	Negro Tenant.....14.02 bu. per @
6	Negro Cropper.....13.12 bu. per @

TABLE XIII—Average Production Per Acre of Leading Cash Crops for Different Classes of Farms  
(For Mountain County)\*

TOBACCO		CORN	
1	White Tenant.....632 lbs. per @	1	White Cropper.....25.8 bu. per @
2	White Cropper.....624 lbs. per @	2	White Tenant.....25.8 bu. per @
3	White Owner.....517 lbs. per @	3	White Owner.....25.4 bu. per @

\*No cotton raised in this county.

From Tables XI, XII, and XIII it is apparent that the landless men do not suffer by comparison with land-owners in crop yields. In the case of tobacco production in the Coastal Plain county it is the landless men who produce the best yield. This is true probably because of the careful supervision which they receive from the landlords and because they use their whole families to assist in producing and caring for the crop. The negro owner-operator falls below the negro tenant probably for the same reason. None of the landless classes ranks high in the Piedmont county where this careful supervision is absent.

**LIVESTOCK PRACTICES**

It is universally recognized that North Carolina needs more livestock on the farms of all sections of the State. The presence of animals indicate three significant things in farming and farm life. Work animals lessen the amount of human manual labor. Dairy stock assist in solving the home food supply problem. Stock cattle, swine, sheep, and goats furnish the basis of mixed and diversified farming and help to maintain soil fertility. It is when we measure North Carolina farming in these terms that tenant- and cropper-farming show up at their worst. Tables XIV to XVII give the *ownership* of livestock rather than the presence of livestock and so make cropper-farming appear worse than it is. The landlord generally furnishes the work animals for his croppers. Even so, the absence of other types of livestock is tragic and the small amount of horse power used by croppers is striking. The white tenants in the Coastal Plain county have only about two-thirds as many livestock per acre as the landlords have and about four-fifths as many as the owner-operators have.

TABLE XIV—*Tilled Acres Per Farm Animal*  
(Coastal Plain County)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Work stock.....	6.75	6.55	11.2	10.0	12.9	12.88	194.0	388.0
Bulls, calves and stock cattle.....	92.3	52.5	4.75	-----	117.2	15.45	485.0	970.0
Cows.....	38.1	35.0	38.1	40.0	74.0	12.88	138.5	277.0
Hogs.....	2.5	1.88	.26	5.45	3.33	4.81	2.05	4.1
Goats and sheep.....	46.3	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Poultry.....	.397	.51	.04	.445	.44	.835	.33	.66

TABLE XV—*Tilled Acres Per Farm Animal*  
(Piedmont County)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Work stock.....	11.1	7.15	8.54	8.8	8.5	10.74	-----	21.3
Bulls, calves and stock cattle.....	9.64	14.30	17.9	17.6	18.2	23.1	34.7	6.1
Cows.....	11.2	10.6	9.15	12.2	10.65	12.65	21.7	19.4
Hogs.....	6.06	7.84	4.17	7.45	4.48	9.25	8.28	10.93
Goats and sheep.....	66.6	-----	106.	-----	31.95	-----	-----	-----
Poultry.....	.23	.27	.215	.37	.24	.27	.35	.555

TABLE XVI—*Tilled Acres Per Farm Animal*  
(Mountain County)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Work stock.....	27.05	-----	16.5	-----	11.18	-----	188.5	-----
Bulls, calves and stock cattle.....	10.0	-----	13.05	-----	27.10	-----	46.1	-----
Cows.....	22.8	-----	14.6	-----	11.71	-----	11.6	-----
Hogs.....	16.95	-----	11.98	-----	7.65	-----	11.8	-----
Goats and sheep.....	13.05	-----	55.7	-----	152.5	-----		-----
Poultry.....	.737	-----	.535	-----	.359	-----	.29	-----

From Tables XIV, XV, and XVI the following facts are apparent:

1. That the landless farmers have a poorer livestock ratio than farm owners have.

2. That the croppers own practically no animals. This is due to the fact that practically all their work stock are furnished by the landlords from whom they rent.

TABLE XVII—*\*Total Farm Animals, Excluding Poultry, Per Crop Acre by Tenure Class*

(For the area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	.61	.73	.50	.31	.41	.43	.40	.25
Piedmont.....	.465	.429	.531	.387	.521	.323	.198	.164
Mountain.....	.314	-----	.335	-----	.345	-----	.199	-----

  

	Total	Landed	Landless	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	.41	.65	.341	.474	.301
Piedmont.....	.415	.475	.329	.486	.314
Mountain.....	.302	.300	.282	.31	-----

\*Pasture is included in crop acreage. If this were not so the Mountain county would show a much better animal ratio.

The order in which all classes rank in livestock production is as follows:

1	Landlord operator.....	Black	Coastal Plain.....	.73
2	Landlord operator.....	White	Coastal Plain.....	.61
3	Owner operator.....	White	Piedmont.....	.531
4	Tenant.....	White	Piedmont.....	.521
5	Owner operator.....	White	Coastal Plain.....	.50
6	Landlord operator.....	White	Piedmont.....	.465
7	Tenant.....	Black	Coastal Plain.....	.43
8	Landlord operator.....	Black	Piedmont.....	.429
9	Tenant.....	White	Coastal Plain.....	.41
10	Cropper.....	White	Coastal Plain.....	.40
11	Owner operator.....	Black	Piedmont.....	.387
12	Tenant.....	White	Mountain.....	.335
13	Owner operator.....	White	Mountain.....	.335
14	Tenant.....	Black	Piedmont.....	.323
15	Landlord operator.....	White	Mountain.....	.314
16	Owner operator.....	Black	Coastal Plain.....	.31
17	Cropper.....	Black	Coastal Plain.....	.25
18	Cropper.....	White	Mountain.....	.199
19	Cropper.....	White	Piedmont.....	.198
20	Cropper.....	Black	Piedmont.....	.164

### HOME-PRODUCED FOOD SUPPLIES

Farming should always be an enterprise the chief object of which is to make possible an adequate life for the families who farm. At many points in the Social Information will be found indexes to the standards of living of the families surveyed. The items of home-produced food supplies are presented here in order that they may be presented near the items of cash incomes. Farming is a combination of producing for the market and for home consumption. A detailed study was made of the chief items in the families food supplies. Only such items as sugar, salt, and spice were left out of the investigation.

Tables XVIII to XXI present the basic and summarized information.

TABLE XVIII—*Living Raised and Bought Per Family*  
(Coastal Plain County)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Value living—raised.....	\$ 400	\$ 514	\$ 386	\$ 474	\$ 323	\$ 200	\$ 194	\$ 156
Value living—bought.....	.56	.82	.131	.134	.93	.113	.96	.110
Total value.....	\$ 456	\$ 596	\$ 517	\$ 608	\$ 416	\$ 313	\$ 290	\$ 266
Per cent living—raised.....	87.7	86.2	74.7	78.0	77.6	63.8	66.9	58.6
Per cent living—bought.....	12.3	13.8	25.3	22.0	22.4	36.2	33.1	41.4

TABLE XIX—*Living Raised and Bought Per Family*  
(Piedmont County)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Value living—raised .....	\$ 517	\$ 323	\$ 467	\$ 346	\$ 328	\$ 198	\$ 257	\$ 172
Value living—bought .....	71	82	154	186	62	115	98	114
Total value .....	\$ 588	\$ 405	\$ 621	\$ 532	\$ 390	\$ 313	\$ 355	\$ 286
Per cent living—raised .....	87.9	79.7	75.2	65.0	84.2	63.2	72.4	60.2
Per cent living—bought .....	12.1	20.3	24.8	35.0	15.8	36.8	27.6	39.8

TABLE XX—*Living Raised and Bought Per Family*  
(Mountain County)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Value living—raised .....	\$ 627	-----	\$ 545	-----	\$ 475	-----	\$ 410	-----
Value living—bought .....	13	-----	24	-----	28	-----	34	-----
Total value .....	\$ 640	-----	\$ 569	-----	\$ 503	-----	\$ 444	-----
Per cent living—raised .....	98.0	-----	95.8	-----	94.44	-----	92.35	-----
Per cent living—bought .....	2.0	-----	4.2	-----	5.56	-----	7.65	-----

TABLE XXI—*Living Raised and Bought Per Family*  
(Total area surveyed)

	Landed	Landless	White	Black	Total
Value raised .....	\$ 481	\$ 270	\$ 447	\$ 213	\$ 382
Value bought .....	70	86	62	121	78
Total value .....	\$ 551	\$ 356	\$ 509	\$ 334	\$ 460
Per cent raised .....	87.3	75.8	87.8	63.8	83.0
Per cent bought .....	12.7	24.2	12.2	36.2	17.0

1. The per cent of the total family food supply that is raised on the farm descends almost consistently from landlord to owner to tenant to cropper in all counties.

2. The per cent of total food produced at home is universally higher for the land-owning families than it is for the landless families and higher for the white families than for the negro families.



3. The total value of food supplies for families averages highest in the Mountain county, next in the Coastal Plain and lowest in the Piedmont.

Tables XXII to XLII present detailed analyses of different items of food supply.

TABLE XXII—*Average Number of Gallons of Milk Produced Per Year Per Family*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	180.6	353	170.6	200	92.6	83.6	78.2	32.9
Piedmont.....	502	283.5	519.5	369	341	327.5	278	170.5
Mountain.....	609.9	-----	551.5	-----	521.2	-----	426.5	-----
Total.....	482	316	549	352	308	177	222	65.3

TABLE XXIII—*Per cent of Families Who Produce Milk*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	39.6	60.0	40.0	20.0	20.8	35.7	17.1	9.0
Piedmont.....	100.	83.3	98.7	89.5	92.5	97.0	92.4	91.0
Mountain.....	92.7	-----	99.8	-----	100.	-----	94.6	-----
Total.....	80.2	72.6	94.3	81.2	66.0	86.1	55.6	28.6

TABLE XXIV—*Quarts of Milk Per Day Per Individual*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	.393	.438	.432	.33	.203	.152	.179	.0706
Piedmont.....	.142	.691	1.17	.705	.819	.612	.586	.341
Mountain.....	1.5	-----	1.14	-----	1.12	-----	1.03	-----

TABLE XXV—Average Number of Pounds of Butter Produced Per Family  
Per Year  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	55.8	73.0	30.5	52.0	24.99	16.79	18.46	10.45
Piedmont.....	148.6	95.8	165.9	115.6	110.6	114.4	84.7	72.5
Mountain.....	125.1	-----	134.9	-----	115.4	-----	117.5	-----
Total.....	114.1	94.0	135.5	107.8	78.5	77.8	60.8	23.4

TABLE XXVI—Per cent of Families that Produce Butter  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	37.5	60.0	40.0	20.0	20.8	35.7	13.8	7.1
Piedmont.....	94.8	66.6	92.1	100.0	87.5	92.5	75.8	74.5
Mountain.....	95.6	-----	98.6	-----	98.6	-----	94.8	-----
Total.....	79.7	62.6	93.6	81.5	64.5	82.6	49.5	25.1

TABLE XXVII—Average Number Pounds of Pork Raised for Home Use  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	697	1025	912	580	597	328	375	337
Piedmont.....	654	502	532	412	360	368	405	201
Mountain.....	438	-----	438	-----	347	-----	282	-----
Total.....	582	739	504	432	452	360	346	305

TABLE XXVIII—*Per cent of Families Who Produce Pork*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	64.7	100.0	85.1	60.0	79.3	57.1	50.0	67.9
Piedmont.....	86.2	83.4	93.7	92.1	82.5	93.9	69.3	77.2
Mountain.....	89.9	-----	93.2	-----	97.2	-----	73.7	-----
Total.....	81.7	90.9	92.7	88.4	86.8	87.6	60.6	70.2

TABLE XXIX—*Average Number of Pounds of Lard Produced Per Family*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	150.0	350.0	176.0	160.0	121.5	66.0	73.8	59.1
Piedmont.....	91.0	51.7	65.5	51.8	44.9	37.6	52.0	24.6
Mountain.....	73.5	-----	66.4	-----	59.7	-----	43.1	-----
Total.....	101.0	169.0	76.5	64.5	84.5	41.6	60.4	50.7

TABLE XXX—*Per cent of Families Who Produce Lard*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	66.6	100.0	85.0	60.0	79.2	50.0	46.5	67.7
Piedmont.....	86.1	83.5	91.0	89.5	72.6	81.9	61.6	68.6
Mountain.....	89.7	-----	93.4	-----	92.1	-----	76.4	-----
Total.....	82.1	91.0	91.1	86.1	84.6	76.2	58.7	72.0

TABLE XXXI—Average Number of Dozens Eggs Produced Per Family Per Year  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	104.5	83.0	86.9	148.0	106.5	48.5	90.0	41.5
Piedmont.....	78.9	60.0	33.8	32.7	64.8	41.3	42.6	29.4
Mountain.....	88.6	-----	71.4	-----	70.0	-----	66.6	-----
Total.....	89.9	70.5	61.15	46.0	83.9	41.8	76.3	23.1

TABLE XXXII—Per cent of Families Who Produce Eggs  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	85.5	100.0	85.2	100.0	76.6	78.6	87.9	71.5
Piedmont.....	93.1	83.4	81.1	97.4	94.9	95.5	92.5	87.7
Mountain.....	92.8	-----	96.4	-----	98.5	-----	100.0	-----
Total.....	91.0	91.0	90.6	96.6	85.9	92.5	92.5	74.9

TABLE XXXIII—Average Number of Poultry Produced Per Family  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	72.7	54.0	48.0	54.0	62.5	23.6	53.5	27.5
Piedmont.....	49.1	30.0	50.9	32.9	33.2	27.2	20.4	20.3
Mountain.....	56.5	-----	47.3	-----	43.2	-----	44.3	-----
Total.....	58.5	40.8	48.0	35.5	49.2	26.6	46.4	26.2

TABLE XXXIV—*Per cent of Families Who Raise Poultry*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	85.5	100.0	85.2	100.0	86.0	78.9	87.9	71.9
Piedmont.....	93.1	83.4	92.4	97.4	94.9	97.0	89.7	94.4
Mountain.....	94.1	-----	99.7	-----	100.0	-----	97.2	-----
Total.....	91.5	91.0	97.6	97.6	94.1	93.7	94.9	88.5

TABLE XXXV—*Average Number of Barrels of Flour Produced Per Family*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Piedmont.....	1.17	.17	1.11	.34	.35	.19	-----	-----
Mountain.....	8.5	-----	2.6	-----	1.9	-----	2.2	-----
Total.....	3.74	.14	1.92	.31	.79	.13	.77	-----

TABLE XXXVI—*Per cent of Families Who Produce Flour*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Piedmont.....	25.8	16.6	15.2	18.4	7.5	7.6	-----	-----
Mountain.....	62.4	-----	56.2	-----	46.5	-----	50.0	-----
Total.....	33.2	.92	39.5	16.5	19.3	1.63	1.75	-----

TABLE XXXVII—Average Number of Bushels of Potatoes Produced  
Per Family  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	40.1	28.0	40.9	49.2	30.2	25.6	6.91	19.1
Piedmont.....	29.2	26.5	24.2	23.5	18.8	12.1	10.6	8.96
Mountain.....	19.9	-----	21.8	-----	18.8	-----	15.8	-----
Total.....	28.4	27.1	24.0	26.5	23.6	14.6	10.5	16.5

TABLE XXXVIII—Per cent of Families Who Produce Potatoes (Irish  
and Sweet)  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	81.2	60.0	85.0	100.0	70.1	71.6	72.4	75.7
Piedmont.....	89.9	83.3	91.2	89.5	87.5	92.5	61.5	68.6
Mountain.....	92.5	-----	100.0	-----	100.0	-----	94.7	-----
Total.....	88.5	72.6	97.6	90.6	95.1	98.9	78.9	73.5

TABLE XXXIX—Average Number of Bushels of Meal Raised Per Family  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	9.15	7.2	8.15	12.0	6.75	4.92	7.11	5.6
Piedmont.....	8.91	5.31	9.05	8.1	4.7	8.9	1.69	3.76
Mountain.....	21.7	-----	24.1	-----	21.7	-----	22.3	-----
Total.....	13.9	6.15	18.6	8.55	11.95	8.19	12.3	5.25



TABLE XL—*Per cent of Families Who Produce Meal*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	73.0	60.0	65.2	60.0	62.5	42.7	63.6	46.3
Piedmont.....	77.6	66.6	82.5	65.7	45.0	51.5	23.0	40.0
Mountain.....	95.5	-----	97.2	-----	100.0	-----	100.0	-----
Total.....	84.5	63.6	90.6	65.0	72.7	50.0	71.5	44.7

TABLE XLI—*Average Number Gallons of Sorghum Molasses Produced Per Family*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	.104	.48	2.55	3.0	.572	1.82	.102	.625
Piedmont.....	3.48	2.5	1.73	7.13	3.05	7.02	-----	.315
Mountain.....	11.45	-----	15.9	-----	16.2	-----	6.2	-----
Total.....	5.7	3.53	10.5	6.64	6.5	5.84	2.2	.55

TABLE XLI (a)—*Per cent of Families Who Produce Molasses*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	2.04	20.0	1.5	20.0	5.2	7.15	1.74	6.25
Piedmont.....	19.0	16.6	13.9	29.0	14.9	39.4	-----	5.23
Mountain.....	5.8	-----	62.1	-----	79.0	-----	34.2	-----
Total.....	2.97	18.3	4.41	27.9	35.0	33.7	12.8	6.1

TABLE XLII—*Per cent of Families Who Raise Garden and Orchard Products*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	87.5	100.0	95.0	100.0	100.0	78.7	89.7	89.0
Piedmont.....	93.2	83.5	97.4	100.0	97.5	100.0	92.1	91.0
Mountain.....	92.6	-----	98.1	-----	100.0	-----	100.0	-----
Total.....	91.1	91.0	98.5	100.0	99.7	96.3	97.5	89.3

In Tables XXII to XLIII the following general facts appear:

1. That the land-owning families are almost universally producing more home supplies than are the landless.

2. The order of priority generally runs landlord-operator, owner-operator, tenant, cropper. Where this order is violated it is most often because the owner-operator is out-producing the owner-landlord.

3. The Coastal Plain county is best in the production of pork, lard, poultry, eggs, and potatoes.

4. The Piedmont county is best in flour and about the same as the Mountain county in butter.

5. The Mountain county is best in milk, meal, and molasses, and about the same as the Piedmont county in butter.

6. Nevertheless the Mountain county farmers are producing the most home supplies, the Coastal Plain county next and the Piedmont county least.

7. The absence of milk is the most striking among all these items. The mountain farmers are the only ones that consistently produce more than a quart of milk per day per individual. This falls as low as .07 quart per day per individual for the negro croppers of the Coastal Plain county. This means less than three-tenths of a glass of milk per day per individual. This information is given in Table XXIV.

8. From Table XXVI it is seen that less than 50 per cent of the farmers of the Coastal Plain county produce butter. Over 92 per cent of the black croppers of this county do not produce butter and only three per cent of them buy butter.

9. The Coastal Plain county has an exceptionally good home production of pork and lard.

10. There are less than 50 head of all kinds of poultry per family for all families surveyed.

11. Home supplies should be considered in conjunction with cash income in order to gain an adequate appraisal of consumption habit.

## CASH INCOME

The last section presented the facts concerning home supplies produced by the different tenure classes. These facts, in conjunction with cash income, give a picture of the sources from which these people must get their food and other consumption goods. An appraisal of the consumption units of products produced on the farm for home consumption shows all of these people to be cash crop farmers. Tables XLIII to XLV show the amount of cash income these people get with which to purchase additional consumption goods.

TABLE XLIII—*Annual Cash Income Per Family*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	\$2385.85	\$1996.00	\$1129.50	\$1670.00	\$ 854.15	\$ 711.07	\$ 700.84	\$ 640.59
Piedmont.....	994.70	379.00	604.17	536.15	336.35	374.24	364.74	208.60
Mountain.....	680.16	-----	261.84	-----	172.84	-----	155.89	-----

TABLE XLIV—*Annual Cash Income Per Individual*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	\$ 452.65	\$ 226.81	\$ 253.82	\$ 253.03	\$ 174.45	\$ 118.51	\$ 143.13	\$ 125.64
Piedmont.....	252.55	84.33	124.27	92.19	73.92	64.40	64.74	36.87
Mountain.....	154.88	-----	49.49	-----	33.62	-----	34.24	-----

TABLE XLV—*Daily Cash Income Per Individual*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	\$ 1.255	\$ .622	\$ .695	\$ .694	\$ .478	\$ .324	\$ .392	\$ .344
Piedmont.....	.705	.23	.34	.252	.201	.176	.177	.101
Mountain.....	.424	-----	.135	-----	.092	-----	.093	-----

From Tables XLIII, XLIV, and XLV it is apparent:

1. That landless farmers have a lower cash income than land-owners. This fact coupled with the fact that they almost universally produce a smaller amount of home supplies indicates the conditions under which they live.

2. The cash income is from three to five times as high in the Coastal Plain county as in the Mountain county.

3. The cash income per person of white tenants and white croppers of the Mountain county is less than 10 cents per day and that for the negro croppers of the Piedmont county is barely 10 cents per day.

### CREDIT

The average farmer uses credit for three chief purposes: land purchases, operating funds, and store supplies. Tables XLVI to LIV show the per cent who use credit, the amount they used, the purpose for which they use it, and the sources from which they obtain it.

TABLE XLVI—*Amount and Use of Short-Time and Intermediate Credit*  
(For Coastal Plain County)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Per cent use credit.....	83.5	100.0	90.0	100.0	92.2	78.6	89.6	97.4
Average credit per family.....	\$723.00	\$734.00	\$422.00	\$723.00	\$455.00	\$401.00	\$360.60	\$314.00
Per cent for living.....	50.1	52.9	62.8	51.6	55.5	62.4	68.6	66.9
Per cent for fertilizers, seed, etc...	49.9	47.1	37.2	49.4	44.5	37.6	31.4	33.1

TABLE XLVII—*Amount and Use of Short-Time and Intermediate Credit*  
(For Piedmont County)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Per cent use credit.....	34.5	83.2	58.2	81.6	82.0	97.0	61.6	91.1
Average credit per family.....	\$ 46.50	\$173.00	\$ 43.80	\$124.00	\$102.00	\$128.00	\$123.00	\$110.00
Per cent for living.....	25.6	28.5	42.7	43.2	43.1	51.0	56.8	49.8
Per cent for fertilizers, seed, etc...	74.4	71.5	57.3	56.8	56.9	49.0	43.2	51.2

TABLE XLVIII—*Amount and Use of Short-Time and Intermediate Credit*  
(For Mountain County)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Per cent use credit.....	2.9	-----	8.02	-----	5.6	-----	15.8	-----
Average credit per family.....	\$ 15.95	-----	\$ 16.04	-----	\$ 5.00	-----	\$ 6.21	-----
Per cent for living.....	54.6	-----	13.3	-----	100.0	-----	95.8	-----
Per cent for fertilizers, tools, seed, etc.....	45.4	-----	86.7	-----	-----	-----	4.2	-----

TABLE XLIX—*Source of Short-Time and Intermediate Credit*  
(For Coastal Plain County)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Per cent from merchant.....	76.0	86.4	82.2	100.0	82.3	93.4	78.1	79.0
Per cent from landlord.....	-----	-----	-----	-----	11.6	6.5	18.1	20.5
Per cent from landlord who is merchant also.....	-----	-----	-----	-----	2.56	-----	2.75	-----
Per cent from bank.....	21.1	13.6	16.6	-----	3.19	-----	1.05	-----
Per cent from other sources.....	2.9	-----	1.2	-----	.35	.1	-----	.5

TABLE L—*Source of Short-Time and Intermediate Credit*  
(For Piedmont County)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Per cent from merchant.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	95.8	62.0	62.6	25.8
Per cent from landlord.....	-----	-----	-----	-----	0.7	20.8	18.7	66.2
Per cent from landlord who is merchant also.....	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	17.0	-----	-----
Per cent from bank.....	-----	-----	-----	-----	2.7	-----	18.7	8.0
Per cent from other sources.....	-----	-----	-----	-----	.8	-----	-----	-----

TABLE LI—*Source of Short-Time and Intermediate Credit*  
(For Mountain County)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Per cent from merchant.....	100.0	-----	29.2	-----	100.0	-----	89.0	-----
Per cent from landlord.....							4.2	
Per cent from landlord who is merchant also.....								
Per cent from bank.....			10.4					
Per cent from other sources.....			60.4				6.8	

TABLE LII—*Source of Short-Time and Intermediate Credit*  
(For area surveyed)

	Land Owners	Landless	Whites	Blacks	All
Per cent from merchant.....	81.4	78.0	79.7	78.4	79.27
Per cent from landlord.....		17.33	7.3	17.9	11.10
Per cent from landlord who is merchant also.....		2.54	1.3	2.2	1.63
Per cent from bank.....	14.7	1.83	9.4	1.2	6.40
Per cent from other sources.....	3.9	.3	2.3	.3	1.60

TABLE LIII—*Some Aspects of Short-Time Farm Credit*

	Land Owners	Landless	All
Per cent use credit.....	37.1	75.8	58.2
Average credit per family.....	\$137.50	\$224.10	\$182.40
*Per cent "Restrictive" credit.....	25.2	74.07	56.53
Per cent from bank.....	14.7	1.83	6.40
Per cent for living.....	34.75	60.0	50.9
Per cent for fertilizers, tools, etc.....	65.25	40.0	49.1

\*"Restrictive Credit" is credit granted by some one who has power of restricting or controlling the activities of the ones to whom it is granted.



TABLE LIV—*Per cent of Farmers Who Produce Crops Under Crop Lien or Landlord Credit*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	15.9	78.0	9.7	27.7	48.16	96.6	68.25	98.4
Piedmont.....	46.4	96.60	29.3	69.5	37.0	97.7	70.7	90.7
Mountain.....			5.2				14.4	

  

Land Owners	Landless	White	Black	All Surveyed
25.2	74.07	37.3	90.1	56.53

Governor Bickett described the crop lien as "the boll weevil of North Carolina." A total of \$185,000 of credit was used by the 1,014 families surveyed or an average of \$182.40 per family for the year. More than a half (50.9 per cent) of this credit went for food, clothing, and home supplies. The remainder was used for fertilizer, tools, and stock feed. The landless used 62.4 per cent of their credit for living purposes as compared to 43.8 per cent used for this purpose by the land-owners. This means that a larger per cent of the credit of the tenants and croppers goes for consumption goods than for production goods.

The Coastal Plain farmers use the vast majority of all credit—\$436 to the family as compared to \$93.50 for a Piedmont family and \$10 for a Mountain family. In the Coastal Plain county only 7.7 per cent of all those surveyed did a cash business as compared to 25.4 per cent in the Piedmont county and 41.8 per cent in the Mountain county. Of the entire landless group surveyed 24.2 per cent do cash business as compared to 62.9 per cent of the land-owners who finance themselves.

Four-fifths (81 per cent) of all the credit comes from merchants, 11.1 per cent from landlords, 6.4 per cent from banks and 1.6 per cent from other sources—mainly neighbors and relatives.

Two kinds of this credit—that from merchants where a crop lien is given and that from landlords—may be called "restrictive" credit. In cases involving 56.53 per cent of all the credit of the 1,014 families surveyed the creditor may exercise "restrictive" powers over the sale of the farm product and may by indirect methods dictate the rate of interest charged. The landed classes use only 25.2 per cent of restrictive credit as compared to 74.07 per cent for the landless.

A survey of farm credit in North Carolina has recently been made by F. R. Yoder, H. L. Beardsley, and A. J. Honeycutt, representing the North Carolina Division of Markets, the State College of Agriculture

and The United States Department of Agriculture. This survey found that the average interest charged by banks for short-time credit amounted to a little more than 6 per cent as compared to as high as 34 per cent of crop-lien credit for the colored cropper. The average cost of short-time credit for the whole state was found to be more than 25 per cent.

From this analysis of the short-time credit system of the farmers it can be seen that croppers and tenants as well as the landed classes are bearing an unusually high "restrictive" interest burden and this may be one of the reasons for their failure to attain farm ownership.

### WEALTH AND EQUITY

The total and itemized wealth and equity holdings of each farmer was obtained. His equity was calculated by subtracting his incumbrances and personal debts from his total wealth and capital holdings. Tables LV to LX give the facts in detail.

TABLE LV—Average Wealth and Equity  
(Coastal Plain County)

	Owner Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Wealth per family .....	\$16,025	\$11,639	\$ 4,734	\$4,568	\$1,111	\$ 440	\$ 503	\$ 219
Wealth per person .....	3,021	1,320	1,066	692.4	227.20	73.40	99.40	43.0
Equity per family .....	14,494	8,974	3,998	3,908	868	226	352	126
Equity per person .....	2,750	1,019	889	597	177.4	37.68	72.15	24.83
Per cent insolvent .....					6.5	28.5	24.2	18.75

TABLE LVI—Average Wealth and Equity Per Family  
(Piedmont County)

	Owner Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Wealth per family .....	\$10,423	\$3,342	\$3,159	\$2,054	\$521	\$406	\$251	\$108
Wealth per person .....	2,715	742.50	650	353	115.05	72.45	46.75	18.58
Equity per family .....	9,860	3,197	2,938	1,673	426	294	208	36
Equity per person .....	2,552	711	602	288	93.50	50.80	38.70	6.40
Per cent insolvent .....				2.63	2.5		23.5	17.15

TABLE LVII—Average Wealth and Equity Per Family  
(Mountain County)

	Owner Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Wealth per family.....	\$9,583	-----	\$3,550	-----	\$468	-----	\$338	-----
Wealth per person.....	2,220	-----	667.20	-----	88.40	-----	74.30	-----
Equity per family.....	9,390	-----	3,401	-----	452	-----	308	-----
Equity per person.....	2,170	-----	664	-----	88	-----	67.60	-----
Per cent insolvent.....	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

TABLE LVIII—Percentage Wealth and Equity Held by Landed and Landless  
(For area surveyed)

	Coastal Plain		Piedmont		Mountain		Total	
	Landed	Landless	Landed	Landless	Landed	Landless	Landed	Landless
Per cent of families.....	23.2	76.8	54.1	45.9	68.0	32.0	48.4	51.6
Per cent of persons.....	24.2	75.8	50.7	49.3	68.3	31.7	47.6	52.4
Per cent of wealth.....	86.7	13.3	94.6	5.4	96.5	3.5	92.7	7.3
Per cent of equity.....	88.7	11.3	95.5	4.5	96.5	3.5	93.9	6.1

TABLE LIX—Percentage Wealth and Equity Held by White and Black  
(For area surveyed)

	Coastal Plain		Piedmont		Mountain		Total	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Per cent of families.....	59.9	40.1	56.8	43.2	-----	-----	72.3	27.1
Per cent of persons.....	57.7	42.3	51.0	49.0	-----	-----	69.7	30.3
Per cent of wealth.....	89.5	10.5	87.1	12.9	-----	-----	92.8	7.2
Per cent of equity.....	91.1	8.9	88.7	11.3	-----	-----	94.1	5.9

TABLE LX—Average Amount Equity Held by Families of Different  
Tenure Classes  
(For area surveyed)

	Coastal Plain		Piedmont		Mountain*	
	Per Family	Per Individual	Per Family	Per Individual	Per Family	Per Individual
Landed.....	10,770	2,008	4,900	1,036	5,270	1,050
Landless.....	402	79.60	263	48.50	402	81.45
Whites.....	4,250	860	4,330	957	-----	-----
Blacks.....	601	111.70	714	125	-----	-----

\*There was too small a number of black farmers in the Mountain county to make percentages trustworthy.

The following conclusions are pertinent in relation to wealth and equity holding:

1. That while the land-owner families compose only 48.4 per cent of all the families surveyed, they own 92.7 per cent of the entire wealth of all families and 93.9 per cent of all the equity.

2. That while the white families compose only 73.3 per cent of all the families they control 92.8 per cent of the total wealth and 94.1 per cent of all the equity.

3. 16.4 per cent of all landless men are insolvent; 27.4 per cent of all negro tenants, 25.6 per cent of all white croppers, 22.1 per cent of all negro croppers and 3.2 per cent of all white tenants were insolvent. Only one land-owner, a negro owner-operator in the Piedmont county, was insolvent.

4. In the Coastal Plain county where the tenancy rate is highest, the difference between the wealth and equity holdings of the landed and landless is greatest and in the Mountain county where the tenancy rate is lowest the difference between these classes in their wealth and equity holdings is least.

5. The equity holdings per family for the landed in the Coastal Plain county is \$10,770. This is the highest for any section. The average for the landless families in the Piedmont is \$263. This is the lowest for any section. The holdings for the negro croppers in the Piedmont county is only \$36. This is an average of \$6.40 per person for this class.

6. 13 per cent of all the farm lands included in the survey was being farmed by insolvent men.

#### WHY SOME FARMERS ARE LANDLESS

Why is it that more than 117,000 farmers in North Carolina are landless? No question is more difficult to answer. There is one answer, vague though it is, which no one can deny as correct: these men thus

far have been unable to climb the ladder of agricultural success to ownership. The assumption is that a prospective farmer will begin as a hired laborer or cropper on his father's or some other farmer's land, that he will soon become a share or cash tenant and will ultimately become an owner of some piece of land which he can call his own. If the so-called "Agricultural Ladder" by means of which men climb to land ownership is working according to the method by which the great majority of American farmers became land proprietors in the past there should be a constant stream of farmers making the steady ascent from laborer to cropper, from cropper to tenant and from tenant to ownership.

No one will deny that there is a great difference between men and that many a landless man has failed to climb the ladder to ownership because he was personally incompetent. Even his personal incompetency always has a history and is generally the result of some adequate causes. The Tenancy Commission could not possibly make an analysis of the personal characters of the thousand farmers it interviewed. It did attempt to ascertain something about each one's family history and especially attempted to gain a concrete knowledge of the farming history of each. Tables LXI to LXIV give the facts concerning these items.

TABLE LXI—*Family History of Tenure Classes*  
(Coastal Plain County)

	Per Cent Whose Father Was Owner		Per Cent Whose Father Was Tenant		Per Cent Whose Father Was Cropper		Per Cent Whose Father Was Landless	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Croppers.....	48.4	2.7	32.8	18.7	10.2	75.0	43.0	93.7
Tenants.....	40.3	-----	51.9	69.2	7.8	30.8	59.7	100.0
Owner operators..	90.0	60.0	10.0	40.0	-----	-----	10.0	40.0
Landlords.....	72.9	60.0	18.8	40.0	8.3	-----	27.1	40.0

TABLE LXII—*Family History of Tenure Classes*  
(Piedmont County)

	Per Cent Whose Father Was Owner		Per Cent Whose Father Was Tenant		Per Cent Whose Father Was Cropper		Per Cent Whose Father Was Landless	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Croppers.....	15.4	14.7	69.2	55.8	-----	29.5	69.2	85.3
Tenants.....	72.5	7.6	27.5	6.1	-----	86.3	27.5	92.4
Owner operators..	84.8	18.9	15.2	78.4	-----	2.7	15.2	81.1
Landlords.....	98.3	-----	1.7	83.4	-----	16.6	1.7	100.0

TABLE LXIII—*Family History of Tenure Classes*  
(Mountain County)

	Per Cent Whose Father Was Owner		Per Cent Whose Father Was Tenant		Per Cent Whose Father Was Cropper		Per Cent Whose Father Was Landless	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Croppers.....	57.9	-----	36.8	-----	5.3	-----	42.1	-----
Tenants.....	50.8	-----	47.8	-----	1.4	-----	49.2	-----
Owner operators..	82.7	-----	16.7	-----	.6	-----	17.3	-----
Landlords.....	94.4	-----	2.8	-----	2.8	-----	5.6	-----

From the Tables LXI to LXIII it is apparent:

1. That the tenure status of a person's father has considerable to do with the tenure status of the person himself. The present land-owners are sons of land-owners in 81 per cent of the cases, while landless men are sons of land-owners in only 30 per cent of the cases.

2. Only 19 per cent of the land-owners included in the territory surveyed arose to ownership out of landless families. Seventy per cent of the landless farmers are sons of landless farmers. These facts make it apparent that ownership on the part of the father is a great assistance to ownership on the part of the son and landlessness on the part of the father is a barrier difficult for the son to surmount.

3. A smaller per cent of the negroes than of the whites, both landed and landless, have come from owner families. In fact less than 10 per cent of all the negro farmers are sons of land-owning farmers. In spite of the fact that 19.2 per cent of all the negroes are land-owners.

A few generations ago a land-owner practically always gained ownership by climbing the agricultural ladder. The ascent was easy in those days because of the low price of land. The climb has become more and more difficult as the prices of the land have increased.

The result is that fewer men successfully make the climb. They either remain at the bottom as croppers or get stalled in the tenant stage. Oftentimes they rise to tenancy and then slip back to cropper. Sometimes they even attain ownership and then slip back to one of the lower tenure types.

Notwithstanding the fact that the ascent to ownership is difficult, 59 per cent of all white farmers surveyed and almost 20 per cent of all negro farmers surveyed are owners of land. An attempt was made to discover how these men obtained ownership of farms. Table LXIV gives the facts concerning the tenure history of the various tenure classes.

TABLE LXIV (a)—*Per cent Who Have Attained Different Tenure Statuses*  
(For area surveyed)

	Coastal Plain		Piedmont		Mountain		All Surveyed		Total
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	
Owners who have been Croppers.....	34.9	70.0	30.7	70.5	24.3	-----	27.8	65.8	32.6
Owners who have been Tenants.....	46.1	50.0	50.4	75.0	29.4	-----	38.4	65.8	41.0
Tenants who have been Croppers.....	59.7	85.6	47.5	72.7	56.3	-----	56.1	75.0	61.6
Tenants who have been Owners.....	10.4	7.15	5.0	-----	9.86	-----	9.3	2.56	8.1
Croppers who have been Tenants.....	-----	5.38	-----	8.57	10.5	-----	3.67	15.0	7.82
Croppers who have been Owners.....	-----	.89	-----	-----	10.5	-----	3.23	2.56	3.07

From Table LXIV(a) the following conclusions appear:

1. Less than 50 per cent of the present land-owners had ever been landless. The remainder started farming with ownership of land.

2. Less than 40 per cent of the present white owners were ever landless farmers.

3. About two-thirds of the present negro farm owners started farming without ownership of land.

4. Only 27.8 per cent of the present white owners started at the bottom of the agricultural ladder, i. e., as croppers; 65.8 per cent of the present negro owners started as croppers.

5. 61.6 per cent of the present tenant farmers started as croppers. The remainder started either as tenants or started as owners and dropped into the tenant class.

6. 8.1 per cent of the present tenants had at one time attained ownership and then slipped into tenancy. This had been the experience of a greater per cent of the whites than of the negroes.

7. 7.8 per cent of the croppers had at one time been tenants and had dropped into the cropper class. This had been the experience of a much larger per cent of negroes (viz.: 15 per cent) than of the whites.

8. 3.07 per cent of the present cropper-farmers had at one time been owners.

9. It is not easy to climb this agricultural ladder from landlessness to ownership, nor has a very large per cent of the present land-owners obtained their ownership by that method alone.

Men who now own farms have gained their proprietorship by means of purchases, gifts, and inheritance. Even their purchases were often made by security which some relative furnished or by aid through other

financial means than straight-out gifts. Land purchases are here considered, however, in the following table, as if they were made solely by means of assets which the purchaser had made by tenant and cropper farming or had been accumulated in other occupations. An attempt was made to discover the methods by which land-owners had come into ownership in Table LXIV(b).

TABLE LXIV (b)—*Per cent of Land Wealth Acquired by Purchase and by Gift, Inheritance, and Marriage\**

	Coastal Plain				Piedmont				Mountain		Area Sur- veyed
	Operator Landlord		Owner Operator		Operator Landlord		Owner Operator		Operator Landlord	Owner Operator	Land Owners
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	White	
Purchase...	22.5	32.0	48.0	19.6	74.7	80.4	54.4	87.5	26.2	36.3	41.0
Gift, inheri- tance and marriage.	77.5	68.0	52.0	80.4	25.3	19.6	35.6	12.5	73.8	63.7	59.0

\*Based on values at time of acquirement.

From Table LXIV it is apparent that the majority of land-ownership was not gained by individual effort in farming. Among the whites considerably more than one-half of their present wealth was given to them. In the case of the negro land-owners more than one-third of their wealth was given to them. This is not said by way of disparagement to these worthy citizens who own their farms, but rather to prove that even where men have reached the stage of ownership they did not always do it unassisted. It would seem therefore that we are not justified in expecting the present tenants and croppers to gain ownership without help. As a matter of fact only 19.7 per cent of the 436 white owners claimed to have gained ownership without assistance, either money or other property gifts and inheritance. A total of 270 of these owners or 61.9 per cent of them never were either tenants or croppers. In the Mountain county 70.6 per cent of the present owners started farming as owners. Furthermore, consideration should be given to the fact that most men inherited their wealth at about the age of thirty. At that time they got the deed to their land the value of which has since greatly increased. Inheritances or gifts at the time they were received constituted a much greater percentage of their wealth-holding than they do at the present.

Are the men who are now tenants and croppers ever going to be land-owners? Needless to say they will not if they are expected to gain ownership through methods by which the majority of present landholders



gained ownership, namely, by inheritance and gifts. Most of them must make the climb by successful farming or not at all. Of the white owners surveyed, 166 had successfully made the climb and from them some suggestions can be gotten regarding the possibilities of the now landless group doing the same thing. The land-owners who have fought their own way became croppers at the average age of 22.4 years. They made the transfer to tenant-farming at the average age of 24.5 years, and became owners at the average age of 36.2 years. They climbed the ladder of agricultural success to some degree of ownership in the average of 13.8 year. The average age of the present cropper group is now 36.6 years. They have been farming for an average of 15.2 years and are still landless. The average age of the present tenant group is 38.2 years. They have been tenants for 8.5 years and have been farming for 15.8 years and are still landless. Both of these groups have passed the average age at which the present owners first attained ownership. Some of these men will undoubtedly some day become owners. The great majority of them never will unless they receive assistance from some source. Even those who will reach ownership will do so at a considerably later age than did the present group of owners. Land is higher priced now than then and it will therefore take the present landless men longer to accumulate enough capital to make the initial payment on a farm.

The number of tenants and croppers are increasing every year. A larger and larger percentage of farm land is being farmed by these landless farmers. Each year sees a higher per cent of all farm values under the direction of these men. North Carolina can not look with complacency on these facts. The late Governor Bickett said in his inaugural address "that he would neither rest nor allow the State to rest until every honest, industrious, and frugal man who tills the soil has a chance to own it." This is but justice to these men. He further said, "Every consideration of progress and safety urges us to employ all wise and just measures to get the lands into the hands of the many." This is a policy of wisdom and statesmanship on the part of the State.

### THE HOMES

Very careful and detailed studies were made of each of the 1,014 farm residences. The number of rooms in each house and the use of that room space was ascertained. Housing experts have generally accepted standards of minimum comfort to be one and one-half rooms per person and one and one-half persons per bedroom. This means that a normal house should include three rooms for each two persons and two bedrooms for each three persons. Tables LXV to LXXII give the information for the farm homes surveyed.

TABLE LXV—Average Number of Rooms Per Home  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers		Total	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain---	5.64	3.8	4.55	3.8	4.2	4.0	4.12	3.42	4.58	3.52
Piedmont-----	5.67	5.0	4.67	3.98	4.1	4.02	3.54	3.0	4.77	3.82
Mountain-----	5.02	-----	4.06	-----	3.64	-----	2.88	-----	4.03	-----
Total-----	5.42	4.46	3.95	3.95	3.98	4.02	3.62	3.33	4.38	3.72

TABLE LXVI—Average Number of Persons Per Room  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers		Total	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain---	.93	2.3	.98	1.74	1.16	1.5	1.19	1.49	1.09	1.53
Piedmont-----	.68	.90	1.04	1.46	1.11	1.45	1.52	1.9	.946	1.51
Mountain-----	.87	-----	1.31	-----	1.41	-----	1.59	-----	1.24	-----
Total-----	.825	1.45	1.19	1.5	1.24	1.46	1.34	1.57	1.11	1.52

TABLE LXVII—Average Number of Persons Per Bedroom  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers		Total	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain---	1.63	2.59	1.62	2.75	1.89	2.15	1.91	2.28	1.8	2.3
Piedmont-----	1.23	1.59	1.6	2.02	1.47	2.16	2.19	3.0	1.49	2.24
Mountain-----	1.55	-----	2.44	-----	2.59	-----	2.74	-----	2.26	-----
Total-----	1.47	1.87	2.06	2.1	1.99	2.16	2.16	2.44	1.89	2.27

TABLE LXVIII—Average Persons Per Bed  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	1.16	1.69	1.06	1.27	1.42	1.83	1.44	1.52
Piedmont.....	.82	.93	1.1	1.39	1.24	1.5	1.49	1.62
Mountain.....	.92	-----	1.25	-----	1.53	-----	1.48	-----
Total.....	.95	1.29	1.19	1.37	1.42	1.55	1.46	1.55

An average landless farmer had 3.74 rooms in his house as compared with 4.66 for the owners. The average white farmer had 4.38 rooms in his house as compared to 3.72 for a negro farmer. The homes of landless men had 1.38 persons per room as compared to 1.07 for the owner homes. The white homes had 1.11 persons per bed as compared to 1.52 for the negro homes. The landless homes had 216 persons for each 100 bedrooms, and 149 persons for each 100 bedrooms and 112 persons for each 100 beds in the homes of landowners.

The white homes had 189 persons for each 100 bedrooms and 121 persons for each 100 beds as compared to 227 persons for each 100 bedrooms and 153 persons for each 100 beds in the negro homes. All the homes surveyed had 199 persons for each 100 bedrooms and 128 persons for each 100 beds.

TABLE LXIX—A Classification of the Homes According to the Number of Rooms  
(For area surveyed)

	Land Owners	Landless	Whites	Negroes	All Surveyed
Per cent 1 room....	1.4	2.5	2.2	1.4	2.0
Per cent 2 rooms....	9.2	15.1	12.2	12.5	12.2
Per cent 3 rooms....	17.6	31.5	20.5	35.9	24.7
Per cent 4 rooms....	24.2	24.4	22.4	29.2	24.4
Per cent 5 rooms....	13.1	14.5	15.2	10.3	13.8
Per cent 6 rooms....	19.2	7.4	15.8	6.1	13.1
Per cent over 6 rooms	15.3	4.6	11.7	4.6	9.8

Table LXIX shows that 17.6 per cent of the landless farmers are living in homes of one and two rooms as compared to 10.6 per cent for the owners. 14.4 per cent for all whites and 13.9 per cent for all negroes lived in one- and two-room houses. 14.2 per cent of all families lived in houses with less than three rooms.

Large families housed in small homes often means that the family must eat in the kitchen, sleep in the sitting room or in other ways mix household functions.

TABLE LXX—*Percentage of Families With Separate Sitting-Rooms*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers		Total	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain...	25.0	60.0	40.0	20.0	16.9	7.2	5.2	2.7	17.9	4.4
Piedmont.....	25.8	33.3	7.5	-----	-----	3.0	-----	-----	11.1	2.7
Mountain.....	23.2	-----	11.4	-----	12.7	-----	-----	-----	13.6	-----
Total.....	24.6	27.3	12.6	2.3	11.7	3.75	2.75	2.04	17.8	3.5

TABLE LXXI—*Percentage of Homes With Separate Dining-Rooms*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers		Total	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain...	68.7	60.0	60.0	20.0	20.8	14.1	34.5	20.5	40.4	21.3
Piedmont.....	74.1	33.3	44.2	05.5	80.0	19.7	07.7	11.8	57.8	14.5
Mountain.....	65.1	-----	46.9	-----	45.1	-----	21.1	-----	48.4	-----
Total.....	69.0	45.5	47.5	6.97	42.5	18.75	26.6	18.38	48.4	17.4

TABLE LXXII—*Percentage of Homes With Separate Parlors*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers		Total	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain...	22.9	60.0	10.0	20.0	5.2	7.1	6.9	.91	9.9	4.4
Piedmont.....	34.5	-----	13.9	2.6	5.0	3.0	7.7	-----	12.9	2.1
Mountain.....	11.6	-----	6.8	-----	4.2	-----	2.6	-----	10.6	-----
Total.....	22.3	27.3	9.2	4.65	4.8	3.75	5.5	.68	10.7	3.7

Fifty-two per cent of the 490 land-owners had dining rooms separate from other rooms as compared to 28.8 per cent for the 524 landless. Only 48.4 per cent of the white families and 17.8 per cent of the negro families had dining rooms separate from other rooms. The percentage for all families surveyed was 39.

Ten and four-tenths per cent of the land-owners had parlors separate from other rooms as compared to 3.6 per cent for the landless. Only 10.6 per cent of all whites and 3.2 per cent of all negroes had separate parlors. Only 8.7 per cent of all houses surveyed had parlors.

Sixteen and a half per cent of all land-owners had family gathering rooms separate from other rooms as compared with 5.9 per cent for all landless. Only 13.6 per cent of all whites, and 3.6 per cent of all negroes were provided with such assembling rooms.

Bathtubs, indoor toilets, running water in these modern days, often make a home. The following Tables LXXIII(a) through LXXV give the percentages of homes of the various classes of farmers which have these conveniences.

TABLE LXXIII (a)—*Percentage of Homes With Bath-Tubs, Indoor Toilets, Running Water, and Clothes Closets*  
(For the Coastal Plain County)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers		Total	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Bathtubs.....	8.3	-----	5.0	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	2.4	-----
Indoor toilets...	6.6	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	1.5	-----
Running water...	6.6	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	1.7	-----	2.0	-----
Clothes closet...	2.3	40.0	5.0	-----	-----	13.0	10.2	5.0	14.0	6.5

TABLE LXXIII (b)—*Percentages of Homes With Bath-Tubs, Indoor Toilets, Running Water, and Clothes Closets*  
(For the Piedmont County)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers		Total	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Bathtubs.....	3.4	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	1.05	-----
Indoor toilets...	1.7	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	.52	-----
Running water...	1.7	-----	1.7	10.5	-----	-----	-----	-----	1.05	10.5
Clothes closets..	38.0	-----	6.5	10.5	42.0	-----	-----	-----	22.1	10.5

TABLE LXXIV—*Percentages of Homes With Bath-Tubs, Indoor Toilets, Running Water, and Clothes Closets*  
(For the Mountain County)

	Operator Landlords	Owner Operators	Tenants	Croppers	Total
Bathtubs.....	1.5	.62			.588
Indoor Toilets.....		1.23			.588
Running Water.....		1.85			.882
Clothes Closets.....	8.7	13.0	5.63	2.94	7.35

TABLE LXXV—*Percentages of Homes With Bath-Tubs, Indoor Toilets, Running Water, and Clothes Closets*  
(For the area surveyed)

	Land Owners	Landless	Whites	Blacks	Total
Bathtubs.....	1.84		1.23		.885
Indoor Toilets.....	1.24		.82		.591
Running Water.....	1.66	1.91	1.23		.885
Clothes Closets.....	13.01	8.4	12.9	4.64	10.63

No farm tenant has a bath-tub or an indoor toilet. No negro farmer has a bath-tub, an indoor toilet, or running water. Less than two per cent of the land-owners have either of these three conveniences.

Quite an elaborate analysis of home equipment and home conveniences was made. Tables LXXVI to LXXIX present the finding.

TABLE LXXVI—*Per cent of Homes With Modern Conveniences*  
(For the Coastal Plain County)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Per cent other heat than fireplace.....					11.7	7.2	5.2	7.2
Per cent lights other than lamps.....	10.2				3.5		1.7	
Per cent have washing machines.....	2.1		5.0					
Per cent have sewing machines.....	91.8	100.0	95.0	100.0	80.8	86.0	95.0	69.6
Per cent have vacuum cleaners.....								
Per cent have kitchen sinks.....	10.2	20.0			1.3			
Per cent have telephones.....	12.5		5.0		1.3		1.2	9.0
Per cent have refrigerators.....	16.6		5.0		2.6		1.2	
Per cent have rugs.....	83.5	40.0	25.0	20.0	39.0	14.3	34.6	10.0

TABLE LXXVII—*Per cent of Homes With Modern Conveniences*  
(For the Piedmont County)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Per cent other heat than fireplace.....	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	5.9
Per cent lights other than lamps.....	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Per cent have washing machines.....	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Per cent have sewing machines.....	98.5	100.0	96.1	94.6	87.5	69.8	69.3	37.2
Per cent have vacuum cleaners.....	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Per cent have kitchen sinks.....	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Per cent have telephones.....	41.5	-----	26.6	-----	7.5	-----	-----	-----
Per cent have refrigerators.....	6.9	-----	-----	-----	5.0	-----	-----	-----
Per cent have rugs.....	67.2	33.3	41.7	8.3	12.5	9.1	-----	3.3

TABLE LXXVIII—*Per cent of Homes With Modern Conveniences*  
(For the Mountain County)

	Operator Landlords	Owners Operators	Tenants	Croppers
Per cent other heat than fireplace.....	-----	3.7	2.7	-----
Per cent lights other than lamps.....	1.4	0.6	-----	5.2
Per cent have washing machines.....	4.3	-----	-----	-----
Per cent have sewing machines.....	84.0	86.3	66.2	50.0
Per cent have vacuum cleaners.....	-----	-----	-----	-----
Per cent have kitchen sinks.....	2.8	0.6	-----	-----
Per cent have telephones.....	1.4	0.6	-----	-----
Per cent have refrigerators.....	1.4	-----	-----	-----
Per cent have rugs.....	27.6	17.3	2.8	2.6

TABLE LXXIX—*Per cent of Homes With Modern Conveniences*  
(For the area surveyed)

	Land Owners	Landless	White	Black	Total
Per cent other heat than fireplace.....	1.2	5.2	2.7	2.7	3.1
Per cent lights other than lamps.....	1.4	1.3	2.7	-----	1.4
Per cent have washing machines.....	1.0	0.19	0.82	-----	0.6
Per cent have sewing machines.....	91.4	71.6	84.8	72.4	80.7
Per cent have vacuum cleaners.....	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Per cent have kitchen sinks.....	1.86	0.19	1.2	0.36	0.98
Per cent have telephones.....	11.6	1.14	8.1	0.36	9.0
Per cent have refrigerators.....	3.9	0.97	2.5	-----	1.87
Per cent have rugs.....	35.6	15.2	30.2	10.6	24.6

It is significant to note that 96.9 per cent of all the homes are heated by fireplaces, 98.6 per cent are lighted by lamps, 99.4 per cent of the washing is done by tubs and wash-boards, and 19.3 per cent do all sewing by hand. Not one farm home has a vacuum cleaner, 99.02 per cent have no kitchen sinks, 91 per cent have no telephones, 98.13 per cent have no refrigerators and 75.4 per cent of the families live on bare wood floors.

Screens at the windows and doors are not only home conveniences but health facilities in that they keep flies and mosquitoes out of the house. Tables LXXX and LXXXI give the facts about screening.

TABLE LXXX—*Per cent of Homes With No Screens*  
(For the area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers		Total	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain---	33.4	80.0	60.0	40.0	68.8	85.6	43.2	95.5	52.2	91.9
Piedmont-----	48.2	50.0	68.3	86.8	70.0	92.5	92.3	94.2	64.3	89.7
Mountain-----	44.8	-----	75.3	-----	83.2	-----	94.7	-----	73.0	-----
Total-----	42.9	63.7	72.0	81.4	74.5	91.3	67.0	95.3	64.9	90.8

TABLE LXXXI—*Per cent of Homes Only Partly Screened*  
(For the area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers		Total	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain---	20.8	20.0	15.0	40.0	2.6	7.15	25.8	.9	14.8	3.7
Piedmont-----	5.2	50.0	5.1	7.9	22.5	4.5	7.7	2.9	8.9	6.9
Mountain-----	10.2	-----	-----	-----	2.7	-----	-----	-----	2.6	-----
Total-----	11.4	36.4	2.68	11.6	6.92	5.1	14.7	1.36	7.6	5.3

Tables LXXX and LXXXI show that 81.3 per cent of the homes of landless farmers have no screens as compared to 62.2 per cent for the homes of the land-owners. 64.9 per cent of the homes of the whites and 90.8 per cent of the homes of the negroes have no screens. Only 30.4 per cent of the land-owners, 12.0 of the landless, 27.5 per cent of the whites, 3.9 per cent of the negroes and 20.9 per cent of all surveyed had their houses completely screened.

Information was gathered on the number of windows and their conditions. Tables LXXXII and LXXXIII present the findings.



TABLE LXXXII—*Per cent of Homes With Broken Window-Lights*  
(For the area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers		Total	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain---	16.66	20.0	30.0	40.0	28.5	64.2	34.5	56.2	27.5	55.2
Piedmont-----	34.5	16.6	20.2	55.2	50.0	65.2	30.9	68.6	31.5	61.3
Mountain-----	15.9	-----	12.4	-----	33.8	-----	26.3	-----	19.1	-----
Total-----	22.23	18.2	16.1	53.5	35.05	65.0	31.2	59.15	24.7	58.3

TABLE LXXXIII—*Average Number of Window Frames Per Home*  
(For the area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers		Total	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain---	9.5	10.6	7.7	5.4	7.18	5.85	7.35	5.4	7.83	5.64
Piedmont-----	10.2	7.84	7.7	5.76	6.82	5.77	5.0	3.83	5.39	5.39
Mountain-----	8.7	-----	6.17	-----	5.14	-----	3.9	-----	6.2	-----
Total-----	9.41	9.1	6.75	5.48	6.35	5.78	5.87	5.2	7.15	5.5

Tables LXXXII and LXXXIII show that the average land-owner has 7.66 window frames in his home as compared to 5.79 for the landless, 7.15 for the whites, 5.5 for the negroes, and 6.68 for all 1,014 farm homes surveyed. 21.6 per cent of the homes of the land-owners, 45.6 per cent of the homes of the landless, 24.7 per cent of the homes of white farmers, 58.3 per cent of the negroes and 34.1 per cent of all 1,014 homes surveyed had broken panes.

Tables LXXXIV through LXXXVII give the per cent of farm homes with interior walls covered with tar paper, newspapers, plastering and ceiling.

TABLE LXXXIV—*Per cent of Farm Homes With Tar-Papered Walls*  
(For the area surveyed)

	Owner Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers		Total	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain---	-----	-----	5.0	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	0.5	-----
Piedmont-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	1.5	-----	-----	-----	0.68
Mountain-----	-----	-----	0.6	-----	-----	-----	5.0	-----	0.41	-----
Total-----	-----	-----	.38	-----	-----	1.25	1.83	-----	.054	.35

TABLE LXXXV—*Per cent of Farm Homes With Newspapered Walls*  
(For the area surveyed)

	Owner Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers		Total	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain...	4.0	40.0	5.0	20.0	17.0	28.0	7.0	21.0	10.0	22.8
Piedmont.....	-----	-----	1.26	-----	5.0	1.5	-----	-----	1.58	2.07
Mountain.....	5.8	-----	17.0	-----	17.0	-----	24.0	-----	10.4	-----
Total.....	3.4	18.2	11.5	2.33	14.35	6.25	11.9	17.7	10.35	11.8

TABLE LXXXVI—*Per cent of Farm Homes With Plastered Walls*  
(For the area surveyed)

	Owner Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers		Total	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain...	56.0	20.0	25.0	-----	35.0	21.0	19.0	17.0	35.0	17.0
Piedmont.....	-----	-----	3.8	-----	-----	1.5	-----	3.0	1.58	1.36
Mountain.....	-----	-----	1.8	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	10.4	-----
Total.....	15.4	9.1	4.2	-----	14.35	5.0	10.1	13.6	10.35	8.71

TABLE LXXXVII—*Per cent of Farm Homes With Ceiled Walls*  
(For the area surveyed)

	Owner Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers		Total	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain...	60.0	80.0	60.0	80.0	62.0	64.0	62.0	46.0	62.2	58.0
Piedmont.....	59.0	-----	38.0	29.0	14.0	41.0	54.0	15.0	41.1	29.6
Mountain.....	65.0	-----	49.5	-----	-----	-----	34.0	-----	46.5	-----
Total.....	61.7	36.3	46.4	35.0	29.3	45.0	51.4	38.8	46.5	39.0

Tables LXXXIV to LXXXVII show that 57 out of every thousand landless farmers' homes are covered with tar paper, 135 with newspapers, 118 with plaster and 388 are ceiled. In the land-owners' homes 24 out of every thousand are covered with tar-paper, 80 are covered with newspapers, 80 are plastered and 508 are ceiled. The interior finish of the farm-owner homes is distinctly superior to that of the tenant homes.

Tables LXXXVIII through XC give the per cent of homes without porches, per cent with only one porch and the average number of porches per home.

TABLE LXXXVIII—*Per cent of Homes Which Have No Porches*  
(For the area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers		Total	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain---	2.0	-----	95.5	60.0	18.0	14.1	7.0	33.9	14.5	31.3
Piedmont-----	10.3	33.3	62.05	10.5	22.4	37.9	38.5	55.0	36.3	34.5
Mountain-----	7.3	-----	8.0	-----	12.6	-----	13.1	-----	9.4	-----
Total-----	4.57	18.2	28.0	16.3	17.0	33.8	12.8	38.8	27.8	33.0

TABLE LXXXIX—*Per cent of Farm Homes Which Have Only One Porch*  
(For the area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers		Total	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain---	8.3	20.0	25.0	-----	35.0	64.2	46.5	45.5	30.6	45.8
Piedmont-----	13.8	50.0	5.7	60.5	35.0	42.4	61.5	45.0	17.9	48.3
Mountain-----	43.5	-----	51.8	-----	61.9	-----	65.8	-----	53.8	-----
Total-----	24.0	36.4	35.3	53.4	45.2	46.3	55.0	45.5	38.1	46.4

TABLE XC—*Average Number of Porches Per Home*  
(For the area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers		Total	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain---	1.75	2.0	.705	0.8	1.28	1.07	1.36	.87	1.36	.93
Piedmont-----	1.72	1.17	1.4	1.13	1.2	.88	.69	.45	1.44	.86
Mountain-----	1.48	-----	1.255	-----	1.12	-----	1.8	-----	1.29	-----
Total-----	1.67	1.55	1.31	1.09	1.21	.91	1.18	.78	1.35	.89

Tables LXXXVIII to XC show that for every one hundred landless homes there is a total of 104 porches as compared to 142 porches for every 100 land-owner homes. The land-owners have porches on 80.8 per cent of the houses as compared to 75.2 per cent for those of the

landless farmers. The houses of the landless class have only one porch per house in 47.7 per cent of the cases as compared to 32.8 per cent in the case of the owners. For all homes surveyed, 22.2 per cent have no porches, the landless having no porches in 24.8 per cent of the cases and the land-owners having no porches in 19.2 per cent of the cases.

Tables XCI and XCII give the per cent of farm homes which have basements and sleeping porches. They are self-explanatory.

TABLE XCI—*Per cent of Homes Which Have Basements*  
(For the area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers		Total	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain...	2.1	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	.49	-----
Piedmont.....	10.3	-----	-----	-----	-----	4.55	-----	-----	3.16	2.07
Mountain.....	8.70	-----	4.3	-----	4.24	-----	2.64	-----	5.0	-----
Total.....	7.43	-----	2.68	-----	1.6	3.75	.92	-----	3.27	1.7

TABLE XCII—*Per cent of Farm Homes Which Have Sleeping Porches*  
(For the area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers		Total	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain...	6.3	-----	31.5	-----	2.6	-----	-----	-----	5.9	-----
Piedmont.....	1.725	-----	-----	2.64	-----	-----	-----	-----	.53	.69
Mountain.....	4.35	-----	.62	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	1.17	-----
Total.....	4.0	-----	3.7	2.33	1.06	-----	-----	-----	2.32	.36

### HEALTH AND SANITATION

A great many facts were ascertained about health and sanitation. Specific information was gotten concerning contacts with doctors; expenditure for services of the physician, drugs and patent medicine; medical attendance on mother at time of childbirth; percentage of still births; vaccination for smallpox; inoculation for typhoid; possibilities of contamination of the water supply; and disposal of the human excreta, garbage, and dishwater.

Tables XCIV to XCIX give the contact of the families with doctors.

TABLE XCIV—*Per cent of Families Had a Doctor Call on Them the Previous Year*

(For the area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	83.3	80.0	65.0	80.0	76.7	64.2	84.6	54.9
Piedmont.....	41.5	33.3	40.5	31.6	41.5	42.5	84.6	57.7
Mountain.....	53.6	-----	49.4	-----	50.8	-----	63.2	-----
Total.....	57.7	54.6	47.9	37.2	59.7	46.3	77.1	55.1

TABLE XCV—*Per cent of Families Called at Doctor's Office the Previous Year*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	73.0	60.0	50.0	80.0	58.5	28.5	55.0	57.3
Piedmont.....	8.6	-----	4.5	5.3	12.5	21.2	31.0	0.6
Mountain.....	34.8	-----	31.4	-----	25.3	-----	39.5	-----
Total.....	37.0	27.3	24.9	14.0	36.2	22.5	46.8	44.9

TABLE XCVI—*Average Doctor Calls Per Family for the Past Year*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	7.3	5.0	2.9	1.0	3.3	1.3	4.7	1.4
Piedmont.....	3.0	1.5	1.3	0.71	1.55	1.6	2.8	2.0
Mountain.....	2.9	-----	3.5	-----	1.36	-----	3.9	-----
Total.....	4.15	3.1	2.78	.745	2.21	1.65	4.29	1.53

TABLE XCVII—Average Trips to Doctor Per Family  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	4.0	3.8	2.3	3.2	2.8	0.86	3.0	1.91
Piedmont.....	.35	-----	.16	.16	.45	.45	.77	.21
Mountain.....	1.8	-----	1.7	-----	1.27	-----	.47	-----
Total.....	1.91	1.73	1.34	.51	1.71	5.52	1.85	1.50

TABLE XCVIII—Total Contacts With Doctor Per Family  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	11.3	8.8	5.2	4.2	6.1	2.16	7.7	3.31
Piedmont.....	11.6	1.5	1.46	.87	1.97	2.05	3.57	2.21
Mountain.....	4.7	-----	5.2	-----	2.63	-----	4.37	-----
Total.....	6.05	4.8	4.06	1.26	3.39	2.09	6.13	3.2

TABLE XCIX—Average Distance to Doctor  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	3.7	2.2	2.6	1.0	4.3	3.5	3.3	3.5
Piedmont.....	8.6	7.8	8.4	7.5	8.8	8.7	8.15	8.2
Mountain.....	3.7	-----	4.5	-----	4.5	-----	4.5	-----
Total.....	5.34	5.27	5.5	6.77	5.33	7.77	4.28	4.54

It may be pointed out in summarizing the Tables XCIV to XCIX that 50.5 per cent of the land-owners had a doctor call on them the preceding year as compared to 59.8 per cent for the landless, 57.7 per cent for the whites, 49.8 per cent for the negroes and 54.8 per cent for all surveyed. In addition to home visits by the doctor, 28.2 per cent of the land-owners made trips to the doctor's office as compared with 38.7 per cent for the landless, 33.8 per cent for the whites, 33.1 per cent for the negroes, and 33.2 per cent for all surveyed. This would seem to indicate a larger percentage of sickness in the homes of the landless than in the homes of the land-owners.

Home calls by the doctors and visits to the doctor's office should be considered in conjunction with each other. The land-owner families had the doctor call on them an average of 3.09 times per year and called at his office 1.24 times per year making a total of 4.33 contacts with the doctor per family per year. The landless families had the doctor call on them an average of 2.36 times per year and called at his office 1.5 times per year making a total of 3.86 contacts with the doctor per family per year. It would seem that although the landless families are sick more often than the families of land-owners, that they get less medical attention than the land-owners.

The same differences were found to be true between the whites and negroes, but the extreme poverty of the negroes makes it inadvisable to use contacts with the doctor as a fair comparison. An instance which supports this conclusion is a negro family consisting of father, mother and eight children in the Coastal Plain county who were just recovering from smallpox and who had had no medical attention during their sickness.

The average distance from the home to the doctors' office was 5.3 miles. The comparative distances for the land-owners and landless were 5.53 and 5.25 miles, respectively, and for the whites and negroes 5.27 and 5.82 miles respectively. The expenditure per family for medicine, drugs, patent remedies, and doctor fees is given in the Tables C to CIII.

TABLE C—Average Per Family Expenditure for Doctor Fees, Drugs, and Patent Medicines  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	\$75.00	\$27.00	\$31.09	\$14.08	\$34.14	\$19.00	\$53.06	\$19.00
Piedmont.....	28.05	11.03	15.00	18.45	28.04	24.00	28.13	20.00
Mountain.....	32.04	-----	16.30	-----	17.05	-----	27.03	-----
Total.....	\$42.70	\$19.20	\$17.15	\$18.10	\$27.40	\$23.25	\$41.50	\$18.85

TABLE CI—Average Per Family Expenditure for Doctor Fees and Drugs  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	\$69.00	\$22.00	\$25.09	\$13.00	\$32.08	\$13.00	\$49.06	\$15.00
Piedmont.....	26.00	10.00	12.20	13.85	26.00	19.00	20.07	17.00
Mountain.....	30.07	-----	13.90	-----	13.00	-----	25.00	-----
Total.....	\$39.70	\$16.00	\$14.30	\$13.80	\$24.15	\$18.20	\$37.60	\$15.40

TABLE CII—Average Per Family Expenditure for Patent Medicine  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	\$ 6.00	\$ 5.00	\$ 6.00	\$ 1.08	\$ 2.06	\$ 6.00	\$ 4.00	\$ 4.00
Piedmont.....	2.05	1.03	2.80	4.60	2.04	5.00	8.06	3.00
Mountain.....	2.00	-----	2.40	-----	4.05	-----	2.03	-----
Total.....	\$ 2.96	\$ 3.18	\$ 2.95	\$ 4.30	\$ 3.29	\$ 5.08	\$ 4.00	\$ 3.76

TABLE CIII—Per cent of Families Use Patent Medicine  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	56.2	80.0	94.8	40.0	53.2	92.8	58.7	55.3
Piedmont.....	77.7	66.6	91.3	89.5	87.8	97.0	100.0	97.0
Mountain.....	47.9	-----	48.2	-----	57.8	-----	52.7	-----
Total.....	60.0	72.7	64.2	83.7	62.4	96.3	61.5	66.1

A summary of the tables on expenditures for doctor fees and medicines shows that the landless families spend an average of five cents more per year for doctor fees and prescriptions than land-owner families do. When the average expenditure for patent medicines is added to the average expenditure for doctor fees and prescriptions, the average land-owner family spends sixty-seven cents more for health per year than the average landless family does.



A landed family spends an average of \$26.42 for medical attention per year as compared to \$25.75 for a landless family; \$29.45 for white family; \$19.98 for a negro family, and \$26.84 average for all families. The use of patent medicines was general, 68 per cent of the landless class using them as compared to 64.5 per cent of the land-owner families; 62.3 per cent of the white families; 76.8 per cent of the negro families, and 65.6 per cent of all families. The average family spends \$3.44 for patent medicines per year. The comparative expenditure is \$3.02 for land-owner families; \$2.30 for landless families; \$3.15 for white families, and \$4.19 for negro families. Tables CIV to CXIII give in detail the medical attendance on the mothers during childbirth and the number of stillbirths per family.

TABLE CIV—*Attendance at Births*  
(For the Coastal Plain County)

[illegible]

TABLE CV—*Attendance at Births*  
(For the Piedmont County)

[illegible]

TABLE CVI—*Attendance at Births*  
(For Mountain County)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Doctor.....	92.0	-----	85.2	-----	84.9	-----	80.0	-----
Midwife.....	5.5	-----	14.2	-----	11.2	-----	16.6	-----
Neighbor.....	0.5	-----	0.24	-----	1.6	-----	-----	-----
Unattended.....	2.0	-----	0.36	-----	2.3	-----	3.4	-----
Total.....	100.0	-----	100.0	-----	100.0	-----	100.0	-----

TABLE CVII—*Attendance at Births*  
(For area surveyed)

	Land Owners	Landless	White	Black	Total
Doctor.....	79.7	48.1	80.4	30.3	64.4
Midwife.....	18.7	50.5	17.6	69.4	34.1
Neighbor.....	0.5	0.6	0.8	-----	0.5
Unattended.....	1.1	0.8	1.2	0.3	1.0
Total.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE CVIII—*Per cent of Births Attended by White and Negro Midwives*  
(For the Coastal Plain County)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
White midwife.....	0.9	-----	7.9	-----	18.0	-----	29.6	-----
Negro midwife.....	22.8	66.7	2.3	71.4	21.5	90.5	22.4	85.4
Total.....	23.7	66.7	10.2	71.4	39.5	90.5	52.0	85.4

TABLE CIX—*Per cent of Births Attended by White and Negro Midwives*  
(For the Piedmont County)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
White midwives.....	3.7	-----	1.5	-----	18.0	-----	-----	-----
Negro midwives.....	2.3	46.7	2.0	63.6	-----	58.7	15.8	57.6
Total.....	6.0	46.7	3.5	63.6	18.0	58.7	15.8	57.6

TABLE CX—*Per cent of Births Attended by White and Negro Midwives*  
(For the Mountain County)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
White midwives.....	5.2	-----	12.9	-----	11.2	-----	11.7	-----
Negro midwives.....	0.3	-----	1.3	-----	-----	-----	4.9	-----
Total.....	5.51	-----	14.2	-----	11.2	-----	16.6	-----

TABLE CXI—*Per cent of Births Attended by White and Negro Midwives*  
(For area surveyed)

	Land Owners	Landless	White	Black	Total
White midwives.....	5.9	9.1	11.0	-----	7.4
Negro midwives.....	12.8	41.4	6.6	69.4	26.7
Total.....	18.7	50.5	17.6	69.4	34.1

TABLE CXII—*Average Stillbirths Per Family*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	.25	1.0	0.3	-----	.558	.214	.258	.678
Piedmont.....	.33	.83	.19	.24	0.4	.13	.38	.34
Mountain.....	.39	-----	0.2	-----	.23	-----	.26	-----
Total.....	.33	.92	.203	.21	.399	.15	.275	0.6

TABLE CXIII—*Per cent of Families Had Stillbirths*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	16.7	60.0	20.0	-----	21.8	14.3	20.7	36.0
Piedmont.....	17.2	50.0	10.01	10.5	22.5	10.6	5.3	11.4
Mountain.....	21.7	-----	14.8	-----	16.9	-----	18.4	-----
Total.....	18.8	54.6	13.8	9.3	20.2	11.3	20.2	23.8

The landed families had doctors present at 79.7 per cent of all births as compared to 48.1 per cent for the landless families; 80.4 per cent for the white families; 30.3 per cent for the negro families; 64.4 per cent for all families surveyed. Five births out of every one hundred were unattended except by members of the immediate family. Midwives attended 50.5 per cent of all births in the landless families as compared to 18.7 per cent for the land-owners' families; 17.6 for the white families; 69.4 per cent for the negro families, and 34.1 per cent for all families surveyed.

The landless families had negro midwives present at 41.4 per cent of the births, as compared to 12.8 per cent for the land-owners; 6.6 per cent for the whites; 69.4 per cent for all negroes, and 26.7 per cent for all families surveyed. 19.9 per cent of all landless families had had one or more children born dead as compared to 16.2 per cent for the land-owners, 17.6 per cent for the whites; 19.2 per cent for the negroes, and 18.1 per cent for all surveyed. Tables CXIV to CXV give the per cent of persons vaccinated for smallpox and the per cent inoculated for typhoid.

TABLE CXIV—*Per cent Vaccinated for Smallpox*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	48.6	79.5	47.2	30.3	51.5	27.5	49.0	39.9
Piedmont.....	1.3	14.8	-----	0.9	-----	3.1	4.28	5.1
Mountain.....	40.3	-----	11.6	-----	6.6	-----	11.6	-----
Total.....	30.8	55.0	9.85	4.71	23.08	7.47	30.8	30.98

TABLE CXV—*Per cent Inoculated for Typhoid*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	27.3	61.4	39.3	-----	36.9	3.6	44.7	18.4
Piedmont.....	0.4	14.8	-----	0.9	-----	-----	1.4	-----
Mountain.....	93.5	-----	38.0	-----	25.7	-----	28.9	-----
Total.....	45.2	43.7	27.15	.775	35.9	.64	33.7	13.68

Tables CXIV and CXV show that 18.1 per cent of all persons in the land-owner families were vaccinated for smallpox and 30.7 per cent inoculated for typhoid as compared to 24.1 per cent of the landless vaccinated for smallpox and 19.3 per cent inoculated for typhoid. It was found that 21.2 per cent of all persons surveyed had been vaccinated for smallpox and 24.7 per cent had been inoculated for typhoid. Tables CXVI to CXXV give the possibilities of contamination of the water supply.

TABLE CXVI—*Per cent of Wells Open at Top*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	65.1	20.0	73.7	100.0	70.2	78.6	77.7	86.5
Piedmont.....	44.5	25.0	58.0	59.3	28.6	34.2	84.0	62.7
Mountain.....	66.6	-----	52.4	-----	100.0	-----	75.0	-----
Total.....	55.0	22.2	59.8	65.6	58.05	46.1	78.0	83.5

TABLE CXVII—*Per cent of Wells 10 Feet and Less in Depth*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	4.2	-----	5.0	-----	1.3	21.4	3.5	8.9
Piedmont.....	-----	-----	1.3	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Mountain.....	-----	-----	1.2	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total.....	1.83	-----	3.92	-----	.89	5.77	2.74	7.8

TABLE CXVIII—*Per cent of Wells Between 11 and 20 Feet in Depth*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	66.8	80.0	65.0	80.0	63.7	78.6	72.7	85.8
Piedmont.....	1.7	-----	1.3	-----	-----	21.5	7.7	-----
Mountain.....	7.25	-----	6.7	-----	-----	-----	2.6	-----
Total.....	34.9	33.3	24.5	12.5	43.7	23.1	60.26	75.7

TABLE CXIX—*Per cent of Wells More Than 20 Feet in Depth*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	25.0	40.0	25.0	20.0	31.0	-----	23.8	4.3
Piedmont.....	91.4	66.7	75.9	71.0	87.5	56.1	76.9	48.5
Mountain.....	5.75	-----	4.5	-----	4.2	-----	5.3	-----
Total.....	63.27	66.7	71.58	87.5	55.41	71.13	37.0	16.5

TABLE CXX—*Per cent of Homes With Wells Within 20 Yards of Privy*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	4.17	-----	5.0	-----	3.9	-----	5.17	6.24
Piedmont.....	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	7.7	-----
Mountain.....	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total.....	1.14	-----	.38	-----	1.6	-----	3.67	4.76

TABLE CXXI—*Per cent of Homes With Wells Within 20 Yards of Barn*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	10.4	80.0	15.0	40.0	26.0	71.5	41.4	17.9
Piedmont.....	6.7	-----	.126	5.27	7.5	6.07	7.7	11.4
Mountain.....					1.41	-----	-----	-----
Total.....	4.57	36.4	1.53	9.3	12.75	17.5	22.9	16.3

TABLE CXXII—*Per cent of Homes With Wells Within 20 Yards of House*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	60.4	100.0	80.0	80.0	89.6	85.8	86.2	71.0
Piedmont.....	68.9	50.0	53.2	60.6	52.5	41.0	30.8	8.6
Mountain.....	8.7	-----	3.08	-----	4.2	-----	5.27	-----
Total.....	42.8	72.7	24.15	62.8	49.5	48.75	51.4	63.3

TABLE CXXIII—*Per cent of Homes Secure Water from Springs*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....								
Piedmont.....	6.9	50.0	22.8	23.7	12.5	42.4	15.4	51.4
Mountain.....	87.0	-----	87.1	-----	95.8	-----	89.5	-----
Total.....	36.6	27.3	61.0	20.9	38.3	35.0	33.1	12.2

TABLE CXXIV—*Per cent of Homes Where Yards Drain Toward Well*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....		20.0	5.0	20.0	13.0	21.4	13.8	8.4
Piedmont.....	6.9	16.7	20.3	18.4	15.0	37.9	15.4	34.3
Mountain.....	11.6		13.6		4.2		13.2	
Total.....	6.85	18.2	14.95	18.6	10.1	35.0	13.75	14.3

TABLE CXXV—*Per cent of Homes Where Privy Drains Toward Water Supply*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....		25.0		10.0	15.8		9.0	17.0
Piedmont.....			11.4	7.9	7.5	22.7	7.7	11.4
Mountain.....			4.3					
Total.....		9.1	6.14	6.97	4.78	18.75	2.75	4.76

In summarizing Tables CXVI to CXXV on the possibilities of contamination of the water supply, it must be considered that a large percentage of the homes have no privies as will be shown in a later table. A comparatively large per cent of the wells of the landless class are shallow, open at the top and located within a few steps of the house, barn, and privy. Sanitary conditions on the whole were found to be bad among all the classes surveyed but they were comparatively worse for landless than for land-owners and worse for negroes than whites. The house wells at 4.1 per cent of the homes of the land-owners and 6.5 per cent of the landless is so located in relation to the privy that the surface slopes toward the water supply. The yard and barn drain toward the water supply at 12.4 per cent of the homes of land-owners and 15.8 per cent of the landless homes. More than 5 per cent of all homes surveyed had privies located on higher ground levels than that of the wells, and more than 14 per cent had barns which drained toward the water supply.

Tables CXXVI to CXXX give the sanitary practices used by the homes in the disposal of human excreta, garbage and dish-water.



TABLE CXXVI—*Per cent Have Privies*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	48.0	80.0	45.0	40.0	49.3	21.4	37.9	25.0
Piedmont.....	38.0	-----	1.27	2.6	20.0	4.55	15.4	5.7
Mountain.....	39.2	-----	27.2	-----	9.85	-----	7.9	-----
Total.....	41.1	36.3	20.7	7.0	28.2	7.5	24.8	20.4

TABLE CXXVII—*Per cent of Privies Ever Cleaned Out*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	56.0	50.0	66.6	40.0	68.4	66.6	72.7	53.6
Piedmont.....	70.2	-----	61.4	-----	71.7	-----	33.3	-----
Mountain.....	70.2	-----	61.4	-----	71.7	-----	33.3	-----
Total.....	44.4	50.0	61.2	-----	58.4	33.3	63.0	50.0

TABLE CXXVIII—*Per cent of Privies Sanitary*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	43.4	-----	11.0	-----	47.3	-----	31.8	10.7
Piedmont.....	6.9	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Mountain.....	52.0	-----	34.2	-----	28.5	-----	33.3	-----
Total.....	38.9	-----	29.6	-----	37.8	-----	29.6	10.0

TABLE CXXIX—*Per cent of Families Who Throw Dish-Water in the Yard*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	29.2	60.6	25.0	60.0	33.8	42.82	62.1	57.2
Piedmont.....	8.6	-----	2.5	5.3	-----	9.2	15.4	11.4
Mountain.....	36.2	-----	3.52	-----	31.0	-----	47.4	-----
Total.....	25.2	27.2	24.5	11.6	25.5	15.0	51.4	46.2

TABLE CXXX—*Per cent of Families Who Throw Garbage in the Yard*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	4.7	-----	5.0	-----	45.5	-----	10.4	15.2
Piedmont.....	8.6	-----	2.5	10.5	7.5	9.2	15.4	11.4
Mountain.....	4.35	-----	4.94	-----	2.8	-----	7.9	-----
Total.....	5.71	-----	4.2	9.3	21.2	7.5	10.1	10.09

Only 24.5 per cent of the farms surveyed had privies. Of these privies only 30.2 per cent were sanitary and only 53 per cent had ever been cleaned out.

The landed class had privies at 27.2 per cent of the homes, 33.1 per cent of which privies were sanitary and 50.4 per cent had ever been cleaned out. The landless had privies at 22.1 per cent of the homes, only 26.7 per cent of which were sanitary and 56 per cent had ever been cleaned out.

Dish-water was thrown in the yard at 29.6 per cent of all the homes surveyed and garbage was thrown in the yard at 11.1 per cent of all the homes surveyed. The landless dump dish-water in the yard at 35.1 per cent of the homes as compared to 23.7 per cent for the landed. The landless dump garbage in the yard at 14.9 per cent of the homes surveyed as compared to 5.1 per cent for the land-owners.

### EDUCATION

In the analysis of education the following facts were investigated: illiteracy, schooling of the parents, schooling of children and the amount of reading matter in the homes. Tables CXXXI to CXXXVI give the facts about illiteracy and schooling of the different classes of people.

TABLE CXXXI—*Per cent of Parents Who Can Read and Write*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	81.8	80.0	80.0	90.0	86.5	35.8	70.8	42.3
Piedmont.....	88.9	72.9	98.0	69.8	94.95	63.0	88.5	50.0
Mountain.....	96.5	-----	95.0	-----	89.0	-----	79.7	-----
Total.....	89.7	76.2	94.8	72.2	89.5	51.9	76.0	45.2

TABLE CXXXII—*Per cent of Parents Who Have Attended School*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	83.0	80.0	71.5	80.0	84.5	42.8	70.8	42.3
Piedmont.....	98.0	72.9	100.0	71.1	92.1	63.0	88.5	53.0
Mountain.....	95.85	-----	94.8	-----	89.0	-----	79.7	-----
Total.....	92.8	76.2	95.2	72.2	88.2	59.5	76.0	46.05

TABLE CXXXIII—*Per cent of Fathers Who Can Read and Write*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	81.7	60.0	62.5	100.0	77.5	28.5	58.0	36.7
Piedmont.....	90.0	80.0	100.0	70.5	89.8	48.5	84.5	39.4
Mountain.....	96.8	-----	93.3	-----	86.8	-----	78.4	-----
Total.....	90.7	70.0	93.5	74.4	88.2	45.0	68.6	37.3

TABLE CXXXIV—*Per cent of Fathers Who Have Attended School*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	81.7	60.0	50.0	80.0	74.0	35.7	58.0	37.7
Piedmont.....	100.0	80.0	100.0	73.6	89.8	48.5	84.5	45.5
Mountain.....	96.8	-----	92.5	-----	86.8	-----	75.8	-----
Total.....	93.8	70.0	92.3	74.4	83.1	41.3	67.5	39.6

TABLE CXXXV—*Per cent of Children, Ages Six to Fifteen, Who Can Read and Write*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	82.1	55.0	50.0	72.8	75.1	60.0	61.7	45.0
Piedmont.....	91.5	37.5	84.5	55.2	52.0	70.2	54.6	25.95
Mountain.....	74.3	-----	36.5	-----	60.6	-----	60.8	-----
Total.....	81.4	50.0	50.0	57.8	63.9	68.1	60.0	40.0

TABLE CXXXVI—*Average Grade in School by Father*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	3.75	2.2	2.19	4.2	3.36	.78	2.7	.81
Piedmont.....	6.4	1.8	4.8	2.76	4.87	1.72	2.84	1.48
Mountain.....	8.25	-----	4.38	-----	3.96	-----	3.7	-----
Total.....	6.4	2.0	4.33	2.95	3.97	1.55	3.07	.985

TABLE CXXXVII—*Classes of Operators Ranked According to School Education*

Rank	Class	Average Grade Reached
1	White operator landlords.....	6.40
2	White owner operators.....	4.33
3	White tenants.....	3.97
4	White croppers.....	3.07
5	Negro owner operators.....	2.95
6	Negro operator landlords.....	2.00
7	Negro tenants.....	1.55
8	Negro croppers.....	.985

A summary of the Tables CXXXI to CXXXVII shows that 9.4 per cent of the land-owner parents cannot read and write as compared to 31.3 per cent of the landless; 10.7 per cent of the whites; 46.1 per cent of the negroes, and 20.8 per cent for all surveyed. Of the landless parents, 31.3 per cent have never attended school as compared to 8.2 per cent of the owner parents; 10.5 per cent of the white parents; 35.3 per cent of the negro parents, and 20.3 per cent of all surveyed.

It was found that fathers in the owner families had on the average attained 4.9 grades in school as compared to 2.55 grades for the fathers of the landless families; 4.55 grades for the white fathers; 1.49 for the negro fathers, and 3.69 for the fathers of all families surveyed.

The land-owners' children, from the ages of six to fifteen years inclusive, could read and write in 60.5 per cent of the cases as compared to 57.2 per cent for the children of the landless; 61.8 per cent of the children of the whites; 52.9 per cent for the children of the negroes, and 58.5 per cent for the children of all surveyed.

A thorough analysis was made of the amount of current reading matter which comes into the homes. Tables CXXXVIII to CXLIX present these data in detail.

TABLE CXXXVIII—*Per cent of Families Which Take Different Kinds of Papers and Magazines*  
(For area surveyed)

	Land Owners	Landless	White	Black	All Surveyed
Per cent families take dailies.....	3.50	6.7	26.8	3.2	20.3
Per cent take weeklies.....	31.8	9.0	24.3	8.9	20.0
Per cent take church papers.....	18.6	2.3	13.5	1.4	10.2
Per cent take farm papers.....	35.7	18.5	29.8	18.9	26.8
Per cent take children's papers.....	2.5	0.6	1.8	0.7	1.5
Per cent take magazines.....	26.3	12.2	25.2	2.8	19.0
Per cent take none.....	28.4	65.1	37.6	72.2	47.5

TABLE CXXXIX—*Per cent of Families Which Take No Papers or Magazines*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	16.6	40.0	35.0	40.0	54.6	92.6	50.0	82.1
Piedmont.....	13.8	33.3	17.8	47.4	37.5	66.7	53.8	85.8
Mountain.....	24.6	-----	37.7	-----	57.9	-----	73.8	-----
Total.....	18.85	36.4	31.4	46.5	52.2	71.25	58.7	83.0

TABLE CXL—*Total Papers and Magazines Taken*  
(For the Coastal Plain County)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Number surveyed.....	48	5	20	5	77	14	58	112
Number dailies taken.....	29	1	5	-----	11	-----	5	3
Number weeklies taken.....	15	1	4	4	8	1	5	5
Number church papers taken.....	6	-----	-----	-----	1	-----	2	1
Number farm papers taken.....	24	1	5	3	15	-----	22	9
Number children's papers taken.....	-----	-----	-----	1	3	-----	-----	-----
Number magazines taken.....	27	-----	5	1	22	-----	10	3

TABLE CXLI—*Total Papers and Magazines Taken*  
(For the Piedmont County)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Number surveyed.....	58	6	79	38	40	66	13	35
Number dailies taken.....	22	-----	20	-----	5	1	1	1
Number weeklies taken.....	56	3	62	7	12	6	3	-----
Number church papers taken.....	38	-----	39	2	7	1	1	-----
Number farm papers taken.....	47	2	44	14	22	19	3	4
Number children's papers taken.....	1	-----	4	1	-----	-----	-----	-----
Number magazines taken.....	46	-----	30	2	14	3	1	-----

TABLE CXLII—*Total Papers and Magazines Taken*  
(For the Mountain County)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Number surveyed .....	69	-----	162	-----	71	-----	38	-----
Number dailies taken .....	41	-----	58	-----	6	-----	2	-----
Number weeklies taken .....	15	-----	33	-----	8	-----	1	-----
Number church papers taken .....	18	-----	15	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Number farm papers taken .....	30	-----	49	-----	11	-----	3	-----
Number children's papers taken .....	3	-----	4	-----	-----	-----	1	-----
Number magazines taken .....	37	-----	65	-----	25	-----	10	-----

TABLE CXLIII—*Total Papers and Magazines Taken*  
(For area surveyed)

	Land Owners	Landless	Whites	Negroes	All Surveyed
Number surveyed .....	490	524	733	281	1014
Number daily papers .....	176	35	205	6	211
Number weekly papers .....	200	49	222	27	249
Number church papers .....	118	13	127	4	131
Number farm papers .....	219	108	275	52	327
Number children's papers .....	14	4	16	2	18
Number magazines .....	213	88	292	9	301

TABLE CXLIV—*Per cent of Families That Take Daily Newspapers*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain .....	54.2	20.0	20.0	-----	14.3	-----	8.6	2.7
Piedmont .....	32.3	-----	25.3	7.9	12.5	1.5	7.7	2.85
Mountain .....	55.0	-----	35.8	-----	8.5	-----	5.25	-----
Total .....	48.6	9.1	31.5	6.95	11.7	1.25	7.34	2.7

TABLE CXLV—*Per cent of Families That Take Weekly Newspapers*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	31.3	20.0	20.0	60.0	10.4	7.15	8.6	4.5
Piedmont.....	65.6	0.5	52.0	18.4	30.0	7.5	15.4	-----
Mountain.....	21.7	-----	17.9	-----	11.3	-----	2.63	-----
Total.....	38.8	36.4	28.3	23.3	14.9	7.5	7.34	3.4

TABLE CXLVI—*Per cent of Families That Take Church Papers*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	10.4	-----	-----	-----	1.3	-----	3.45	.89
Piedmont.....	43.2	-----	39.3	5.3	15.0	1.5	7.7	-----
Mountain.....	21.7	-----	8.0	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total.....	26.7	-----	16.8	4.66	3.73	1.25	2.75	.68

TABLE CXLVII—*Per cent of Families That Take Farm Papers*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	46.0	20.0	25.0	60.0	19.5	-----	32.7	7.1
Piedmont.....	39.6	.33	44.3	42.2	40.0	28.8	23.0	11.4
Mountain.....	36.3	-----	26.5	-----	14.0	-----	7.9	-----
Total.....	40.0	27.3	31.8	44.2	21.8	23.7	22.9	8.17



TABLE CXLVIII—*Per cent of Families That Take a Children's Paper*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....				20.0	2.6			
Piedmont.....	1.7		2.5	2.6				
Mountain.....	43.5		2.5				2.63	
Total.....	2.3		2.39	4.66	1.6		.918	

TABLE CXLIX—*Per cent of Families That Take a Magazine*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	27.1		20.0	20.0	15.6		20.6	2.7
Piedmont.....	32.8		22.8	5.3	22.5	3.0	7.7	
Mountain.....	36.3		29.0		24.0		21.0	
Total.....	32.6		26.5	6.95	20.2	2.50	19.3	2.04

Tables CXXXVIII to CXLIX show that over five times as large a per cent of the land-owners as of the landless take daily papers and over three times as large a per cent take weekly papers. Church papers are eight times as prevalent in the land-owners' homes as they are in the homes of the landless, and farm papers about twice as prevalent in the homes of the land-owners as they are in the homes of the landless. Children's papers are about four times as prevalent in the homes of the land-owners as they are in the homes of the landless. The owners take magazines in over twice as high a percentage of cases as the landless families do.

Almost two-thirds of the landless and almost three-fourths of the negroes take no magazines at all.

Of all the families surveyed, 20.3 per cent take daily papers, 20 per cent take weekly papers; 10.2 per cent take church papers; 26.8 per cent take farm papers; 1.5 per cent take children's papers; 19 per cent take magazines, and 47.5 per cent take none of any kind.

An analysis was made of the number and kind of books in the homes. Tables CL to CLIV give the data in detail.

TABLE CL—Average Number of Books Per Home  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	15.2	0.8	1.4	20.2	2.69	1.5	2.24	0.6
Piedmont.....	65.0	15.8	23.8	18.3	17.7	11.75	6.07	4.8
Mountain.....	16.3	-----	7.64	-----	3.56	-----	5.35	-----
Total.....	26.4	9.0	14.1	18.6	6.2	9.9	4.24	1.6

TABLE CLI—Per cent of Families Who Borrow Books  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	25.0	-----	5.0	20.0	15.6	-----	6.9	-----
Piedmont.....	8.6	-----	6.3	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Mountain.....	20.3	-----	27.8	-----	12.7	-----	7.9	-----
Total.....	17.7	-----	19.8	2.33	11.2	-----	6.2	-----

TABLE CLII—Per cent of Homes That Have Bibles  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	89.5	80.0	95.0	100.0	74.0	78.5	86.5	62.0
Piedmont.....	100.0	100.0	98.6	97.2	100.0	78.8	92.2	97.1
Mountain.....	100.0	-----	100.0	-----	100.0	-----	97.2	-----
Total.....	97.3	90.9	99.5	97.7	89.4	78.8	90.8	69.3

TABLE CLIII—*Per cent of Homes That Have No Other Books Than Bibles*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	45.8	80.0	55.0	100.0	57.3	78.5	58.6	82.1
Piedmont.....	5.2	-----	5.1	10.5	5.0	15.1	38.5	28.5
Mountain.....	21.7	-----	27.2	-----	51.2	-----	52.9	-----
Total.....	22.8	27.3	22.6	16.3	43.6	22.8	54.2	70.1

TABLE CLIV—*Kind of Books in Homes*  
(For area surveyed)

	Land Owners	Landless	White	Black	All
Per cent religious.....	14.0	6.5	13.3	7.4	12.4
Per cent agricultural.....	1.3	2.9	1.9	0.4	1.6
Per cent fiction.....	19.4	16.7	19.8	8.4	18.8
Per cent children's.....	22.1	32.8	20.7	49.2	24.4
Per cent others.....	43.2	41.1	44.3	34.6	42.8

The landless had Bibles in 82.3 per cent of the homes as compared to 98.2 for the owners; 95 per cent for all whites; 77.4 for all negroes, and 90.1 for all surveyed. One-half of the landless homes have no other books than Bibles as compared to 22.2 per cent for the land-owners; 32.8 per cent for all whites; 47.1 for all negroes, and 37.6 per cent for all surveyed.

A summary of Tables CL to CLIV shows that an average owner has over four times as many books as a tenant and that the white families have over twice as many books as the negro families have. The practice of borrowing books is three times as prevalent among the land-owners as it is among the landless, and borrowing of books is forty times as prevalent among the whites as among the negroes. More than nine-tenths of all borrowed books were from school libraries.

**RELIGION**

Religious affairs of the communities were investigated by finding the relations of the parents and children to the church and Sunday school. Tables CLV to CLX present the data in detail.

TABLE CLV—*Per cent of Parents Who Are Church Members*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	36.4	30.0	28.6	30.0	78.5	21.4	36.3	35.4
Piedmont.....	96.4	100.0	98.0	98.6	92.7	86.5	53.9	83.3
Mountain.....	85.8	-----	89.0	-----	79.3	-----	76.7	-----
Total.....	75.5	66.7	87.5	90.0	80.0	75.0	52.7	48.3

TABLE CLVI—*Per cent of Parents Who Go to Sunday School*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	15.9	100.0	14.3	-----	25.8	3.6	16.8	12.3
Piedmont.....	90.7	81.8	94.8	89.8	89.8	69.8	38.4	65.05
Mountain.....	92.2	-----	76.1	-----	66.2	-----	63.7	-----
Total.....	70.5	52.5	77.9	78.6	55.8	58.05	35.8	25.8

TABLE CLVII—*Per cent of Parents Who Go to Church*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	93.2	100.0	91.2	90.0	98.3	78.6	80.5	94.0
Piedmont.....	100.0	100.0	99.5	94.3	100.0	98.3	69.2	94.0
Mountain.....	99.2	-----	96.4	-----	95.0	-----	87.8	-----
Total.....	97.7	100.0	97.0	93.7	94.5	96.1	82.0	96.2

TABLE CLVIII—*Per cent of Children, Ages Six Through Fifteen, Who Are Church Members*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	8.95		8.3			3.3	6.7	1.9
Piedmont.....	46.95	8.74	54.9	34.4	8.3	21.5		16.3
Mountain.....	21.4		13.4		4.4			
Total.....	22.5	25.0	22.9	29.5	3.71	17.9	3.1	5.7

TABLE CLIX—*Per cent of Children, Ages Six Through Fifteen, Who Attend Sunday School*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	24.3	5.0	16.6		21.0	13.35	30.0	15.2
Piedmont.....	93.8	75.0	84.8	68.8	54.0	59.7	13.6	51.8
Mountain.....	72.0		67.5		55.2		58.5	
Total.....	58.3	25.0	68.8	59.0	43.6	50.7	37.5	24.5

TABLE CLX—*Per cent of Children, Ages Six Through Fifteen, Who Attend Church*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	75.3	20.0	70.9	36.4	43.2	60.0	61.7	63.2
Piedmont.....	96.0	87.4	87.6	90.0	60.4	94.4	54.6	87.0
Mountain.....	84.0		38.2		69.5		76.1	
Total.....	83.3	39.2	53.2	82.0	58.9	87.5	65.7	69.2

From Tables CLV to CLX, and additional information not included in these tables, the following general facts are apparent: That 83 per cent of the land-owner parents, 64.8 per cent of the landless parents, 79.1 per cent of the white parents, 63 per cent of the negro parents, and 74.5 per cent of all parents are church members. The differences between these various classes are slight, but it should be noted that the landless and negro group are lowest in church membership.

In Sunday school attendance the differences between the groups are about the same.

In church attendance there is very little difference between the different classes, the landless and the negro group following only slightly below the others.

Church membership of the children is twice as prevalent among those of the land-owners as among those of the landless, but only slightly more prevalent among the children of the white than among the children of the negroes.

In Sunday school attendance the landless are again deficient, only 38.5 per cent of the children of the landless parents attending as compared to 62 per cent for the children of land-owners. The negro children fall considerably below the white in the phase of religious activity.

The only exception to the superior showing of the land-owners and whites over the landless and negroes is for church-going among the children. The outstanding fact in this field is the pronounced church-going habit of the negro children, which is probably accounted for by their desire for association with other children. Church membership is more prevalent than going to Sunday school or going to church in practically all cases.

### RECREATION

Two types of recreation were investigated. One of these was the amount of participation in community recreation and the other was the amount and kind of musical instruments in the homes.

The recognized forms of community recreation were taken to be picnics, fairs, sociables, movies, holiday celebrations, chautauquas, lectures, theatres, dances, and other similar forms of amusement and recreation.

An analysis was made to determine the average number of times an individual attended one of these forms of recreation the preceding year. In addition, an analysis was made of the per cent of families who had one or more members who attended one or more of these forms of recreation. The following tables, CLXI through CLXVI, give this analysis in detail.

TABLE CLXI—Average Times Each Person Participated in a Form of Community Recreation the Preceding Year  
(For the area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	3.04	.79	1.73	1.97	1.40	.25	.92	.88
Piedmont.....	3.62	1.52	3.02	1.77	1.76	2.21	1.63	1.92
Mountain.....	3.34	-----	3.04	-----	1.73	-----	1.66	-----
Total.....	3.3	1.07	3.8	1.8	1.6	1.86	1.25	.99

TABLE CLXII—Amount of Participation in Various Forms of Community Recreation by the Different Classes  
(For the Coastal Plain County)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Per cent attend 1 kind.....	16.66	-----	5.0	-----	21.8	7.15	22.4	17.9
Per cent attend 2 kinds.....	16.66	60.0	10.0	-----	16.8	21.45	24.1	17.9
Per cent attend 3 kinds.....	14.6	-----	40.0	80.0	19.5	7.15	8.6	16.0
Per cent attend 4 kinds.....	12.5	20.0	20.0	-----	7.8	7.15	8.6	12.5
Per cent attend more than 4 kinds.....	37.5	-----	15.0	-----	7.8	-----	1.7	2.7

TABLE CLXIII—Amount of Participation in Various Forms of Community Recreation by the Different Classes  
(For the Piedmont County)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Per cent attend 1 kind.....	8.6	-----	3.8	7.9	20.0	3.01	7.7	-----
Per cent attend 2 kinds.....	5.2	33.3	8.9	15.8	12.5	24.3	15.4	22.9
Per cent attend 3 kinds.....	16.2	33.3	29.1	50.0	30.0	33.2	38.5	42.8
Per cent attend 4 kinds.....	13.8	-----	39.2	15.8	17.5	24.3	15.4	11.4
Per cent attend more than 4 kinds.....	31.1	-----	10.1	7.9	17.5	7.6	-----	14.3

TABLE CLXIV—*Amount of Participation in Various Forms of Community Recreation by the Different Classes*  
(For the Mountain County)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Per cent attend 1 kind.....	5.8	-----	9.2	-----	5.6	-----	23.8	-----
Per cent attend 2 kinds.....	13.0	-----	11.7	-----	22.5	-----	7.9	-----
Per cent attend 3 kinds.....	10.2	-----	19.2	-----	22.5	-----	18.4	-----
Per cent attend 4 kinds.....	13.0	-----	20.4	-----	5.6	-----	7.9	-----
Per cent attend more than 4 kinds.	49.3	-----	28.4	-----	15.5	-----	10.5	-----

TABLE CLXV—*Amount of Participation in Various Forms of Community Recreation by the Different Classes*  
(For area surveyed)

	Land Owners	Landless	Whites	Negroes	All
Per cent attend 1 kind.....	8.0	14.1	11.9	9.2	11.2
Per cent attend 2 kinds.....	12.0	19.1	13.8	20.7	15.7
Per cent attend 3 kinds.....	22.6	22.1	19.8	28.8	22.3
Per cent attend 4 kinds.....	20.0	11.8	16.1	14.9	15.7
Per cent attend more than 4 kinds.....	26.6	8.0	21.4	5.7	17.1
Per cent attend none.....	10.8	24.9	17.0	20.7	18.0

TABLE CLXVI—*Per Cent of Families Which Participate in No Form of Community Recreation*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	2.08	20.0	10.0	20.0	27.3	57.1	34.4	33.0
Piedmont.....	24.1	33.3	8.8	2.6	2.5	7.6	23.0	8.6
Mountain.....	8.7	-----	11.1	-----	28.3	-----	31.5	-----
Total.....	12.0	27.3	10.3	4.66	22.3	16.3	32.1	27.2



From Tables CLXI to CLXVI it is apparent that the members of the families of the landless farmers participate in community recreational events to just about one-half the extent that the members of the families of the land-owners' families do, and that the negroes participate just about half as often as the whites.

The landless families had representatives who had attended more than four kinds of community recreation the previous year in 8 per cent of the cases as compared to 26.6 for the landed families, 21.4 for the whites; 5.7 for the negroes, and 17.1 for all surveyed.

No member of 18 per cent of all the families surveyed had participated in or attended any community recreational event during the preceding year. The deficiency was greatest among the landless, next among the negroes, next among the whites, and least among the land-owners.

An analysis of the amount and kind of musical instruments in the homes is given in Tables CLXVII to CLXXIII.

TABLE CLXVII—*Per cent of the Homes With One Musical Instrument*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	51.0	40.0	50.0	60.0	42.0	43.0	50.0	29.0
Piedmont.....	50.0	66.0	40.0	39.0	28.0	9.0	8.0	30.0
Mountain.....	15.0	-----	22.0	-----	21.0	-----	10.0	-----
Total.....	37.2	45.6	29.2	34.9	31.4	15.0	31.2	19.3

TABLE CLXVIII—*Per cent of Homes With Two or More Musical Instruments*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	24.0	-----	-----	-----	14.0	-----	4.0	0.9
Piedmont.....	16.0	33.0	2.5	11.0	-----	15.0	-----	-----
Mountain.....	17.0	-----	8.0	-----	15.0	-----	4.0	-----
Total.....	18.8	18.2	5.75	6.97	5.85	12.26	2.75	.68

TABLE CLXIX—*Per cent of Homes Which Have Victrolas\**  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	35.0	40.0	30.0	40.0	40.0	21.0	36.0	13.0
Piedmont.....	13.0	33.0	6.0	5.0	10.0	12.0	-----	6.0
Mountain.....	21.0	-----	7.0	-----	7.0	-----	10.0	-----
Total.....	22.8	36.4	8.45	9.3	21.2	12.7	22.9	11.6

\*This includes all talking machines.

TABLE CLXX—*Per cent of Homes Which Have Organs*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	16.0	20.0	15.0	-----	9.0	21.0	10.0	15.0
Piedmont.....	39.0	33.0	53.0	5.0	10.0	12.0	7.0	6.0
Mountain.....	23.0	-----	17.0	-----	7.0	-----	-----	-----
Total.....	26.8	45.6	20.3	30.3	6.53	16.2	6.42	14.3

TABLE CLXXI—*Per cent of Homes Which Have Pianos*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	37.0	-----	-----	20.0	6.0	-----	10.0	0.9
Piedmont.....	20.0	-----	7.0	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Mountain.....	5.0	-----	5.5	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total.....	19.4	-----	3.99	2.32	2.66	-----	5.51	.68

TABLE CLXXII—*Musical Instruments in Homes*  
(For area surveyed)

	Land Owners	Landless	Whites	Blacks	Total
Per cent have 1 instrument.....	32.9	28.22	31.85	26.7	32.1
Per cent have 2 instruments.....	10.8	4.77	8.46	5.7	7.68
Per cent have no instruments.....	56.3	67.0	49.7	67.6	61.8
Per cent have victrolas.....	14.28	17.78	17.58	12.69	16.08
Per cent have organs.....	24.1	10.9	16.68	18.5	17.2
Per cent have pianos.....	9.57	2.29	7.78	0.71	5.82

TABLE CLXXIII—*Per cent of Homes With No Musical Instruments*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	25.0	-----	55.0	-----	44.2	-----	46.6	-----
Piedmont.....	34.5	16.6	57.0	60.5	72.5	75.8	92.2	71.5
Mountain.....	65.3	-----	70.4	-----	77.5	-----	86.9	-----
Total.....	44.0	36.4	65.3	55.9	62.8	72.7	66.0	70.1

Tables CLXVII to CLXXIII show that a considerably larger per cent of the landless families have no musical instruments than is the case with land-owning families, and that the negroes and whites are about equal in this respect.

The owner families have two musical instruments in over twice as great ratios as the landless families.

The landless have more victrolas, or other types of talking machines, per family than the land-owners have, but the owner families have four times as many pianos as the landless have. Less than 23 per cent of all families surveyed have pianos or organs.

#### CITIZENSHIP AND SOCIAL CONTACTS

In investigating the social and economic conditions of these various groups of farmers a careful study was made of change of residence to find if they indicated anything regarding the stability of the communities. Tables CLXXIV to CLXXVI present the information on changes of residence.

TABLE CLXXIV—Average Changes of Residence Per Family  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	2.83	3.2	2.05	2.2	4.28	5.29	4.88	5.03
Piedmont.....	2.44	5.0	2.92	4.47	3.92	4.82	5.23	5.43
Mountain.....	2.16	-----	2.64	-----	4.38	-----	4.73	-----
Total.....	2.44	4.18	2.68	4.2	4.25	4.9	4.88	5.13

TABLE CLXXV—Per cent of Changes of Residence Which Meant Changes of  
Community  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	8.83	18.7	12.2	18.2	14.55	2.30	39.6	37.6
Piedmont.....	24.0	-----	20.8	11.2	21.0	16.7	23.6	14.7
Mountain.....	15.4	-----	11.2	-----	11.25	-----	16.65	-----
Total.....	16.15	6.5	14.45	11.6	14.5	17.85	29.7	31.8

TABLE CLXXVI—Average Changes of Residence Per Family Which Meant a  
Change from One Community to Another  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	.25	.60	.25	.40	.62	1.2	1.93	1.89
Piedmont.....	.586	-----	.61	.50	.825	.803	1.06	.80
Mountain.....	.33	-----	.296	-----	.493	-----	.78	-----
Total.....	.394	.273	.388	.488	.617	.875	1.45	1.63

A summary of the preceding tables on changes of residence shows that a land-owner had moved only half as often as the landless farmers, and that the white farmers had moved about three times to the negro farmers four times. The change of residence involved a complete change of community in 31.1 per cent of the cases for the landless families, and in 35.2 per cent for the negro families.

A change of community was here interpreted to mean a move so that the children must attend a different school and the family was within the radius of a different church.

An analysis was made of the number of automobiles and buggies possessed by the different classes of farmers because it was believed that these facts would give an index to the amount of communication and social contacts available to the persons owning them. Tables CLXXVII to CLXXIX give the information on these items in detail and are self-explanatory.

TABLE CLXXVII—*Per cent Have Automobiles*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	92.9	60.0	45.0	60.0	49.4	14.3	34.5	16.96
Piedmont.....	37.95	-----	32.9	7.9	5.0	3.03	-----	-----
Mountain.....	20.3	-----	11.73	-----	2.82	-----	-----	-----
Total.....	40.6	27.25	20.7	13.95	22.33	5.0	18.35	12.92

TABLE CLXXVIII—*Per cent Have Buggies*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	60.4	80.0	55.0	80.0	72.8	71.5	34.45	42.8
Piedmont.....	68.0	83.4	71.0	73.7	70.0	68.2	-----	-----
Mountain.....	17.4	-----	14.8	-----	12.67	-----	-----	-----
Total.....	46.3	81.8	34.1	74.5	22.35	68.75	25.7	32.6

TABLE CLXXIX—*Per cent of Families Which Have No Automobiles, Buggies, or Road Vehicles for Family Conveyance*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	4.17	40.0	10.0	20.0	22.1	28.6	31.04	54.5
Piedmont.....	19.0	16.7	16.45	21.07	27.6	33.3	100.0	100.0
Mountain.....	6.52	-----	71.0	-----	84.5	-----	100.0	-----
Total.....	33.15	27.3	49.8	20.92	46.8	32.5	63.3	65.3

When this survey was planned it was thought that an investigation of the amount of exchange of work would give an index to the neighborhood spirit and coöperation of the various classes of farmers. It was found, however, that it was customary on the larger estates for all the tenants to work together on such work as tobacco curing and other jobs requiring groups of persons.

TABLE CLXXX—*Per cent of Families Which Exchange Work*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	41.6	80.0	40.0	60.0	70.1	78.5	81.0	76.0
Piedmont.....	31.1	16.66	44.3	39.5	52.4	39.4	30.8	42.8
Mountain.....	33.4	-----	53.8	-----	59.1	-----	58.0	-----
Total.....	34.9	45.5	49.8	41.8	62.3	46.2	67.0	68.0

TABLE CLXXXI—*Average Days Exchange of Work Per Family the Past Year*  
(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	13.0	23.0	9.85	8.0	20.0	17.0	22.2	24.4
Piedmont.....	2.64	1.0	3.1	3.4	5.0	1.88	3.5	5.7
Mountain.....	2.58	-----	5.07	-----	6.97	-----	6.4	-----
Total.....	5.5	11.2	4.84	3.95	11.85	4.55	14.2	19.8

An investigation was made to find the number of the parents who were members of some form of community organization other than the church. It was found that 15.4 per cent of the land-owner parents were members of some one of these organizations as compared to 9.75 per cent for the landless; 12.7 per cent of the whites; 11.9 per cent for the negroes, and 12.45 per cent for all surveyed. The following table presents these figures in greater detail:

TABLE CLXXXII—*Per cent of Parents Members of Some Community Organization\**

(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	14.8	10.0	8.6	-----	12.08	17.9	7.97	11.3
Piedmont.....	16.7	18.2	18.2	20.3	8.9	9.8	3.8	7.6
Mountain.....	17.5	-----	12.8	-----	11.8	-----	2.7	-----
Total.....	16.5	14.3	14.35	17.75	11.2	11.25	5.63	10.4

\*Community organization was used to mean some organization other than the church.

Each operator was asked how often his family paid a visit to some neighbor. It was found that a landless family goes visiting 86 times per year as compared to 65 for a landed family, 66 for a white family, 101 for a negro family, and 76 for all families surveyed. Table CLXXXIII presents these figures in detail.

TABLE CLXXXIII—*Average Visits Per Family Per Year*

(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	49	42	67	67	49	74	41	53
Piedmont.....	153	149	62	280	107	146	112	130
Mountain.....	43	-----	45	-----	41	-----	38	-----
Total.....	75	91	53	92	70	87	78	112

Each farmer was asked what he thought of consolidated schools, road bonds, higher education, scientific farming, strict enforcement of the laws and coöperative buying and selling. Each answer was checked as favorable, opposed to, or indifferent. The three following tables give this analysis in detail:

TABLE CLXXXIV—*Per cent of Answers Favorable to Consolidated Schools, Road Bonds, Higher Education, Scientific Farming, Law and Order, and Coöperation*

(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	59.4	36.7	46.7	73.5	45.3	14.3	41.1	17.4
Piedmont.....	79.2	16.6	84.5	18.9	77.5	21.4	47.5	8.6
Mountain.....	64.7	-----	53.0	-----	38.9	-----	43.8	-----
Total.....	64.1	25.8	62.2	23.2	49.7	20.2	42.8	15.3

TABLE CLXXXV—*Per cent of Answers Opposed to Consolidated Schools, Road Bonds, Higher Education, Scientific Farming, Law and Order, and Coöperation*

(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	27.1	20.0	31.7	16.5	37.2	14.3	25.9	44.3
Piedmont.....	9.2	-----	5.9	0.9	6.3	2.8	7.7	1.4
Mountain.....	24.4	-----	20.8	-----	23.9	-----	25.8	-----
Total.....	20.0	15.17	17.1	2.5	25.6	4.7	23.7	34.1

TABLE CLXXXVI—*Per cent of Answers Indicating an Indifference to Consolidated Schools, Road Bonds, Higher Education, Scientific Farming, Law and Order, and Coöperation*

(For area surveyed)

	Operator Landlords		Owner Operators		Tenants		Croppers	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Coastal Plain.....	13.5	43.3	21.6	10.0	17.5	71.4	33.0	38.3
Piedmont.....	11.6	83.4	9.6	80.2	16.2	75.8	44.9	90.0
Mountain.....	20.9	-----	26.2	-----	37.2	-----	30.4	-----
Total.....	15.8	65.1	20.75	69.5	24.6	75.0	33.6	50.5



A summary of Tables CLXXXIV to CLXXXVI on the six questions regarding public and community improvement shows that 58.8 per cent of the answers from land-owners were favorable, 16.8 per cent opposed, and 24.4 per cent indifferent. The answers from the landless were favorable in 34.1 per cent of the cases, opposed in 24.4 per cent, and indifferent in 41.5 per cent. The whites were favorable in 56.5 per cent as compared to 18.7 per cent for the negroes and 46 per cent for surveyed. The whites were indifferent in 22.5 per cent of the cases compared with 20 per cent for the negroes and 20.7 per cent for all surveyed. The whites were indifferent in 22.5 per cent of the cases compared with 61.3 per cent for the negroes and 33.3 per cent for all surveyed. From these facts it would appear that the land-owning farmers are more interested and quite likely more active in promoting community and civic improvement than are the landless farmers, and that the interest of the whites is three times as evident and favorable to improvement as is the case with the negroes.



193721 Ec.H  
puttland  
Author Zimmerman, Carle C. and Taylor, Carl C. Z727e  
Title Economic and social conditions of North Carolina  
farmers.

NAME OF BORROWER.

University of Toronto  
Library

DO NOT  
REMOVE  
THE  
CARD  
FROM  
THIS  
POCKET

Acme Library Card Pocket  
Under Pat "Ref. Index File"  
Made by LIBRARY BUREAU

